

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 12, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to read to members a letter which I received today from the Steward of the Dining Room.

"Subject to a request from the caterer and upon agreement with the Minister responsible, please note, due to the lack of support by the members of the House, the Dining Room will close for the evening dinner period from Monday, June 12th, for the duration of the Legislative Session."

I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 49 students of Grade 4 and 5 standing from the Hartney School, under the direction of Mrs. Janet Suddabay. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

We have 70 students of Grade 6 standing from St. Avila School. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, the Minister of Health and Social Services.

We also have 31 students from the Oak Bluff School, under the direction of Mr. Dennis Clark. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Government House Leader.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, further to a question asked of myself last week on the Beef Income Stabilization, I have a statement I would like to make.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the honourable member got copies?

MR. DOWNEY: I have copies which I would like to distribute.

I wish to now make a statement to the House regarding the payment of the 1977 slaughter animal subsidy under the Manitoba Beef Producers' Income Assurance Program.

Members are aware that in 1976, the Federal Government paid a slaughter animal subsidy payment. This payment was calculated on the basis of the difference between the national average quarterly market price for slaughter animals and the established support level under the terms of the Agricultural Stabilization Act.

However, Friday I was advised, through officials of my department, that the Federal Government would not be making any slaughter animal subsidy payment for 1977.

It is our understanding that the decision not to make a payment is a result of the Federal Government's decision to revert to the formula of a yearly average market price from the quarterly average market price which was used in 1976.

The province has been anxious to make the 1977 payments to Manitoba producers; however, has had to await Ottawa's announcement of their subsidy payment. Officials of my department have been anticipating this announcement and were given every indication in the last five months that the Federal Government would be making a payment for the 1977 year.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Manitoba protests most strongly Ottawa's decision not to pay its slaughter animal subsidy.

Manitoba beef producers have been subject to an intolerable delay in receiving subsidy payments because of Ottawa's indecision. At the same time, there was no prior indication that the Federal Government would not make a payment; indeed, there was every indication they would.

Recognizing the needs of participating farmers, the province has decided to pay contract holders the full subsidy even though the Federal Government is not making any payments under this program. The 1977 provincial payment relates to a subsidy of the 20 percent of the 1976 eligible calves which

Monday, June 12, 1978

were to be finished for the slaughter market and marketed in the period from January 2nd to December 31st, 1977. If the Federal Government had been consistent in using the same procedure as in 1976, it would have resulted in a saving of \$140,000 to \$150,000 to Manitoba. The province will now assume this amount. Slaughter animal subsidy payments in excess of \$2 million will be made to some 3,000 producers under the Beef Producers' Income Assurance Program.

It should be noted that Ottawa's decision not to follow the same procedure as in 1976 will result in a possible loss, to Manitoba producers who finish cattle for the slaughter market, of a substantial amount of money.

The Department of Agriculture has begun to process these payments and we hope, Mr. Speaker, to have them mailed to farmers this next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his statement. I too was somewhat hopeful that the Government of Canada would not alter its formula for payment under its stabilization plan, but nevertheless it appears that they have and it's obviously going to have a negative effect on the Treasury of Manitoba, not on the beef producers of this province, because it should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the producers are protected by contract and therefore since it may not appear clear in the Minister's statement I think it should be worth noting that the Minister is truly not benevolent in picking up the difference, but is obligated under the contractual arrangements entered into between the producers of this province and indeed the government of this province.

I regret that the Minister has not indicated to us just what his position is, or our position, the government's position and the people of Manitoba's position with respect to the other question, and that is the recovery of sums of money under the same Beef Income Assurance Plan. It seems to me that a statement of policy would be in order at this point in time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris) on behalf of Hon. Gerald W. J. Mercier, the Honourable Attorney-General, introduced Bill No. 54, An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act and The City of Winnipeg Act, and Bill No. 56, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, flowing indirectly from the statement just made by the Minister of Agriculture, I would like to ask the Minister if, in light of prevailing cattle prices, whether the Minister could indicate what the projections are by his department insofar as the Beef Income Assurance Program is concerned. Are they projecting any cash flow or net payouts and, if so, what is the estimate or are they expecting recoveries and, if so, what is the estimate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in reply, there has been a fairly substantial upswing in the market for both slaughter and feeder and cows in the past six weeks. There was, however, a reverse situation which took place in the beginning of last week. The market is in a fluctuating position and I would be unable at this time to estimate very closely just what kind of a payback we might be looking at as far as the producers to the province. However, I will, as soon as we have a little more of a position known. It is our intent to honour the contract and it was honoured on the payout and we expect to carry on with very few changes, if any, on the payback to the government.

MR. SCHREYER: Now, Mr. Speaker, more precisely, I would like to ask the Minister if, because the improvement in cattle prices has been in fact dramatic in the last few months, can the Minister say whether in fact they are projecting any payout under this program whatsoever?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in regard to the slaughter cattle payout, the last year is the first year that there is a payout from the province. We will have to wait and see how the stock calves are selling this fall to see where we stand as far as the stock calf part of the agreement holds, whether

in fact the calf market is strong enough to create a payback to the province or whether there still is a payback from the province to the producers. At this time, we are unable to predict as far as the stock calves are concerned what situation we're going to be in. However, I do have indications from the first quarter of this year that we aren't too far off from being even as far as the subsidized level is compared to the amount the support price is. I think that is very close, the first quarter of this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate to direct this question to the Minister responsible for the Task Force. If I could ask the Honourable Minister, without having given him notice, he may wish to take it as notice, and that is to ask whether the Task Force at any time in its operations up to the present day, has at any time retained or obtained the services of government organization consulting professionals from Washington, D.C.?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Task Force.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): I wonder if I understand correctly the Leader of the Opposition as to whether the Task Force hired the services of anyone from Washington, D.C.? —(Interjection)— No, Mr. Speaker. . . . Or otherwise received? Well, I'm not sure that I understand what otherwise received? If the Leader of the Opposition will elaborate, I'll try and answer, but certainly no one was hired that I'm aware of.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the precise reason for my question is to ascertain whether it is correct, as is being contended, that the Task Force on government organization obtained advice, whether on a retainer or unsolicited, I don't know, but received advice with respect to government organization from a consulting group or firm based in Washington or regions.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my assumption is that there are a number of consulting organizations probably amounting to the thousands in Washington and to the extent that they may be offering their services to government, that being the case, I'm not aware of it and I'm not sure what exactly the Leader of the Opposition is referring to. If he could be more explicit, I'll try and answer it.

MR. SCHREYER: I'll rephrase the question, although I doubt I can be more explicit since it is only a contention. May I ask the Minister in this fashion: Has the Task Force on government organization, from its inception to the present day, received on a formal basis advice with respect to the structuring of government organization from a consulting firm based in the Washington, D.C. region? I can't be more explicit than that, I'm sorry.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any specific consulting firm that has provided information. I am aware of the fact that in the examination of structures of government and in the workings of government, there was reference to a variety of different jurisdictions one of which was the federal jurisdiction in the United States and one was with particular state jurisdictions where certain aspects of government operation were in fact examined, one with respect to the civil service particularly where we obtained as best we could, information. That came to a certain extent from the most recent articles written in connection with that and I gather in some cases, by correspondence but no one was retained that I'm aware of or really consulted as such by members of the Task Force or its staff.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Meer for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I've a question to the Minister of Health. Does the Minister intend to investigate the practices of his department in relation to the care of children who have been abandoned, in view of the case that was reported in the Saturday Tribune where officers of his department were reported to be prepared to return to a family a child who had been left abandoned and frozen and where the same family was under court proceedings at the same time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am investigating that situation. Generally, I think there are very rigid and very responsible practices followed by members of the department, but I read the same media reports that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge did

and I want to check that situation out.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister could elaborate, considering that this particular incident took place on a reserve, I think it was Little Grand Rapids, could he indicate what, in fact, is the working arrangement between the Federal and Provincial Governments now for the care and observation of children, and has there been any effort made by his department to respond to the recommendations of the Ryant Task Force, which I think is now three years old, which recommended the Provincial Government begin to establish proper child care services on reserves in Manitoba?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, generally, I would want to take that question as notice but in terms of the specific direction in which the honourable member is aiming, I would say that the subject and the field presents costs and expense ramifications that are very substantial. Up to this point in time, we abide by the precept that the delivery of social services on reserves is the responsibility of the Federal Government. Our position has not altered with respect to that principle, but I would like to take the general question asked by the honourable member as notice.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps if the Minister is taking that question as notice, he would also be prepared to examine and look into the way in which his department is presently dealing with the question of child abuse in areas outside of Winnipeg, particularly in the north, where there is not at this time existing facilities, and does he intend to take any action either to correct the malfunctions of the program as it now appears, or to add any new services or facilities to deal with the issue of child abuse in northern or remote regions?

MR. SHERMAN: We intend to deal with that aspect of the question as quickly as we can. We have moved to expand our capacity to combat child abuse through the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, and have made it plain to our regional offices and our child welfare workers through those regional offices that they can refer cases and certainly appeal to Winnipeg for special help.

In terms of going into Indian Reservations to deliver social services, we are on very tenuous financial ground and I'm sure the honourable member realizes that. I would humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, that I have to look into that subject very carefully.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Parks relating to the Coppermine Bay proposed development on the north shore of Lac du Bonnet. Can the Minister confirm that his department was already working along the process of establishing that Crown land in question as a provincial parkland in February of this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, with regard to that particular project, the land, I understand, is held by Crown lands under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Renewable Resources. The lands have not been transferred to The Parklands Act. I understand that the Bird River Study is being undertaken and that there is public input, and I think maybe this next week there is a meeting, if not this week, where they will be hearing public representation on the overall Bird River plan, and the Local Government District of Alexander will be involved, and that's the process that will have to be undertaken before any development can take place.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary question. Can the Minister assure the local government, which is very concerned about development in their LGD, naturally, can he assure them that they will be consulted before such a project proceeds, and that their decision with respect to local planning will be respected in this case?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, this being in a Local Government District, they have to deal through the Municipal Planning Board, and as a result the Municipal Planning Board has to get involved so that requests will have to come from the municipality or the Local Government District to deal with this, so the final decision does rest with the Local Government District.

MR. BOSTROM: A supplementary question to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, relating to the questions already posed by the Member for Fort Rouge regarding the situation at Little Grand Rapids. Can the Minister assure us that problems associated with that community are being investigated by his department in order that his department can give us some assurance that the type of problem

which came about this last winter will not occur in the future?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well Mr. Speaker, I'm checking into the specific incident that was reported in the media over the weekend and was raised a few moments ago by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Insofar as looking into the problems at Little Grand Rapids generally I would have to say that we have not at this juncture deviated, as I suggested a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, from the principle of federal responsibility where federal responsibility lies and provincial responsibility where provincial responsibility lies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health on the same topic. Does the Minister now see the concern, the validity of the concern that I have had for a Child Abuse Centre that would deal only with Winnipeg, and in this case, I think that the Minister should realize, according to the report, and my honourable friend says he's going to investigate, but it said that the department had custody of the child.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, well I certainly acknowledge the validity of the need for a more effective and a more extensive campaign against child abuse everywhere, in the north and in the rural and remote regions of the province as well as in the south.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, now I would like to rise on the privilege of the House. We have been going through the Estimates of the Department of Health line by line, and when we reached Line 3. Community Operations Division, (b) Medical Public Health Services, (3) External Affairs, (c) St. John's Ambulance, the amount last year was \$20,000.00. This was terminated this year. The Minister, upon being questioned, said that this was a one-shot deal only, that there was no request for this course; it was for the training in the rural areas, for the first-aid course, and there is nothing in the amount. We are still in the Estimates of the department and there has been an announcement in Thursday or Friday's paper that the \$10,000 was going to St. John's Ambulance for training in the rural areas, something that apparently got done.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't know how many times I have to point out to honourable members in this Chamber that reports appearing in the paper are not matters of privilege for this Chamber.\$

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. DESJARDINS: If that's not a point of privilege, then maybe we should ask if the report of the Information Service is correct or not. Has \$10,000 gone to the St. John's Ambulance for the training in the rural areas?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, an Order-in-Council has been passed to that effect.

MR. DESJARDINS: That brings me back, then, to the validity of my point of privilege of the House. Where is that money being voted? We're in the middle of the Estimate and that was terminated and there's no amount in the Estimate: where will that money be taken from?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get an answer to this question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the information that I gave to the House last week during consideration of that item on my Estimates was correct; we had at that point in time not made provision for the St. John's Ambulance Council under that specific appropriation, and you will recall, Sir, there was some discussion at that time as to the reasons for that decision being made, the main one being a lack of measurable response significant enough to appear to justify it. Since that time there have been other indications come to light and certainly in the interests of responsiveness, the government has responded by agreeing to provide \$10,000 in funding for that particular program. We feel there is sufficient money in the appropriation for that Division generally to provide for that; if there isn't, we will have to bring in a request under Supplementary Supply. But the response

Monday, June 12, 1978

is a reaction to the indications that have come to us from persons connected with that particular program in very recent days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface with a fourth question.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister realize that it's quite odd that in three days, all of a sudden everybody wants to take the course, but Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege that I was talking about is, we are going through the Estimates and we are talking about going back and voting extra funds when this is not even finished. I think that the Minister would have had the courtesy to inform the Committee, especially in view of his wrong answer a couple of days ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Once again, may I point out that the member did not have a point of privilege.

The Honourable Member for The Pas. The Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order that it's quite in order for governments to bring in changes in spending Estimates. I would point out, for example, that 10 days after the tabling of the Estimates of Expenditure in Budget last year, within 10 days of the completion of the two there was a Supplementary Supply Bill for \$17 million brought in. —(Interjection)— No, he didn't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, the Job Creation Program was announced during the Budget Debate and the House was advised that special funds would be required and it would be tabled with the House within days after the Budget, and it was.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the amount I'm referring to dealt primarily with the funding of the Public Schools program.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed any further, I should . . . The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks on a point of order.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, the Minister of Finance knows full well that Supplementary Estimates are requested annually as they have already been this year and therefore there was nothing strange done last year as there is nothing strange done this year in Supplementary Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I seek the assistance of the House. If you want to deal with Estimates, I don't know whether I should be in the Chair or not.

The Honourable Member for The Pas with a question.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Continuing Education. I wonder if he could now confirm that the Inter-Universities North Program will offer courses in only three communities this year as opposed to 12 communities in the past years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that at this time. The inter-session courses are taking place under the Inter-Universities North Program at this time, I understand, in at least three locations. The program that will be offered this fall will be finalized, I understand, at a meeting on the 23rd of June.

However, while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I did accept several questions as notice last week in regard to the BUNTEP, IMPACTE Programs at the University of Brandon. I would like to reply to these at this time.

In reply to the question from the Honourable Member for Brandon East regarding control of the BUNTEP and IMPACTE programs, it is correct that the president of Brandon University has taken control of the projects but within the arrangements that have existed for some time. I can assure the honourable member that this has not in any way reduced the ability of the government

to monitor expenditures.

In further replying to a related question from the Honourable Member for Rupertsland regarding the charging of part of the salary of the executive assistant to the president of Brandon University to the IMPACTE and BUNTEP projects, this has been done in relation to the proportion of the time he is spending on the projects as acting projects director.

In reply to a second question from the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, the salary of the previous director of the projects who is now a professor with the projects is being charged to the BUNTEP, IMPACTE project budget.

In reply to a question from the Honourable Member for The Pas as to whether funds are being taken from the projects to fund the office of the president of the University, a portion of the salary of the executive assistant, as I've mentioned, is being charged to the projects to the extent to which such charges are proper. This is also the case with regard to travel expenses.

In reply to a second question from the Honourable Member for The Pas, Mr. Speaker, the normal processes of expenditure review will be continued as they have been carried out in the past.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would be able to inform us what percentage of the program costs are going to administration and what percent of the total program costs are being claimed by the president's office at Brandon University.

MR. COSENS: I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to check and reassure us that the former director of the BUNTEP Program, I would like to know what percentage of his time is now being related to teaching or acting as a professor for the BUNTEP Program and what percentage of his time is being used for normal Brandon University education programs as opposed to the BUNTEP Program.

MR. COSENS: I will also take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday a question from the Honourable Member for Selkirk was taken as notice on my behalf. It concerned an appeal by the Municipality of West St. Paul to the Clean Environment Commission concerning spraying for mosquitoes. I can inform the honourable member that the appeal by the municipality was dealt with, it was rejected and the municipality was advised of a possible alternative course of action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could inform me as to the alternative course of action proposed to the municipality.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the municipalities have the option of applying to the Clean Environment Commission or proceeding under a section of the Act that requires them to file an Impact Statement to the effect that it will not have effects beyond the boundaries of the municipality. In the first case, they had applied to the Clean Environment Commission. The Clean Environment Commission recommended against spraying, a recommendation which I uphold. The other alternative is open to them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. Can the Minister confirm that his professional staff in the Environmental Protection Branch are qualified to give opinions on the effects of chemical spills as they may affect both the physical environment and persons as well?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether the honourable member is referring to a matter of opinion or a matter of fact. The people within my department that occupy various positions, I'm sure have had to meet the qualifications that were required to fulfill those particular positions. Any expression of opinion beyond that, Mr. Speaker, then I cannot vouch for that.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, to that answer then, would the Minister advise specifically whether his environmental engineers are qualified to comment on the detrimental effects of anhydrous ammonia spills both on human beings and on the general environment?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the precise effects of anhydrous ammonia that it would have on a biological organism, then I would have to see whether that is within the realm of the qualifications that are required by people that fill the particular jobs to which the honourable member refers.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. More specifically then to the Minister, can the Minister advise whether the particular environmental engineer who made a public statement last week pertaining to problems relating to the handling of anhydrous ammonia — Well, I've been listening to the Minister of Labour a little too much — whether specifically this particular person, this particular environmental engineer, has the technical competence and the professional abilities to comment on the negative effects, the disastrous effects, that could occur through a spill of anhydrous ammonia.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Brandon that he make his questions quite forthright and leave out much of the flowery language.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister didn't hear me, would the Minister kindly comment or advise the House whether that particular individual, who I referred to, is technically competent to make an opinion on the effects, the disastrous effects that could occur from a spill of this particular chemical?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must advise the Honourable Member for Brandon East that asking for comment on various things is not an appropriate type of question for this particular period, our Question Period. The Honourable Member for Brandon East with another question?

MR. EVANS: All right, I'll pose another question. Can the Minister advise whether this particular professional person is qualified to make that opinion? I ask that because I'm sure the Minister is aware of whether or not his staff are qualified in a particular professional way. I'm asking very simply, Mr. Speaker, and very directly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Brandon East that repetitive questions do not serve the interests of this Chamber. The Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Brandon East on a point of order.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, this specific question is not repetitive, I would suggest. It's asking about this one individual and his competence, and I suggest to you with all respects, Sir, that that is not repetitive with the other questions.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Brandon East that he read the transcript of Hansard. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. Has he been approached by the Mayor of the Town of Gimli, or the R.M., to provide additional funding so that the recreation complex at the Gimli Industrial Park does not run up a substantial deficit or close? Has he been approached?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I will accept that question as notice. There have been some ongoing concerns expressed by the councillors and Mayor in Gimli as to the overall operations of the Gimli Industrial Park site, including the recreational area as well, but I can't recall a specific request, that is a current one having to do with recreation. But I'll accept the question as notice.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Public Works still responsible for the complex, or has he turned over any of his responsibilities to the Minister of Education so that he can implement some of his election promises?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to inform the Honourable Member for Elmwood that I'm only too happy to share the responsibility with the Minister of Education, as being a first-rate

of that Constituency of Gimli and that great Town of Gimli, as I share with all my colleagues, in whatever constituency, representing the concerns of their constituencies.

So the answer to your question is, of course, the Minister of Education shares with me the responsibilities of doing what can be done in the Industrial Parksite in Gimli.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address another question to the first-rate representative from Gimli, in his capacity as the Minister of Education. I wonder if the Minister could tell the House whether he's satisfied that it is a normal expense of the President's office at Brandon University, charged to BUNTEP, for the President to meet with the Committee of Presidents, and whether it is a normal expense to be charged to the BUNTEP Program for the President of the University to meet with the Premier of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, in investigating the matter referred to by the Member for The Pas it was ascertained that the President of the University of Brandon had made a number of trips to Winnipeg. At such times he shares the responsibilities as President of looking after the usual programs at the university with the responsibility of the special projects; and that in fact he charges in relation to the amount of time that he spends with each one of these projects.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then, because of that answer, if the Minister would be prepared then to share with the House a summary of all the trips made by the President so we can get some idea of the percentage that are charged . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for The Pas that an Order for Return is the proper method of handling this matter. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister — I think he is agreeing to check into that matter — whether he would also check into the number of terminated BUNTEP staff, or those whose contracts expire before the end of August, how many of those are being paid full-time and are not now working for BUNTEP? How many persons in that program are now on paid leave?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for The Pas that questions of a detailed nature, such as he is asking, are better handled by an Order for Return and are not proper questions for this time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Before Orders of the Day I have two changes for the Public Utilities Committee. We'll be substituting the name of Mr. Orchard from Pembina for Mr. MacMaster from Thompson; Mr. Ransom from Souris for Mr. McGill of Brandon West.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to note a change also, the Member for Rupertsland to replace the Member for The Pas on the Public Utilities Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Health and Social

and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Department of Labour.\$

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: Lady and gentlemen, we are on Page 54 in the Estimates Book, Item 2.(a)(1), under Workplace Safety and Health, Administration, Research and Education: Salaries \$38,500.00. On Friday last, when we left off, the Member for Lac du Bonnet at the time we concluded at 4:30 was, I believe, speaking and then I had three others on the list: The Members for Transcona, Selkirk and St. Johns. Not seeing the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I will go to the Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe when we concluded actually I was speaking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I apologize.

MR. PARASIUUK: Although I don't mind being confused with the Member for Lac du Bonnet. I was expressing my concern, Mr. Chairman, with the fact that the management of the Workplace Safety and Health Program, which is a new program, was in fact being overloaded, overburdened and not given sufficient resources to carry out the task of developing and bringing onstream a new program.

I think that, in getting answers to our questions regarding the research and education officer and the administrative officer, we found that those positions had been deleted, that those services aren't going to be provided, and that somehow the executive director of the Workplace Safety and Health Program will have to carry that entire burden by himself or herself with only one clerical support person. I would like to inform the Minister that this just won't work. Administratively, it won't work.

Take a look at what you have put down here on Page 54, No. 2. You are saying that this branch is going to just do so much. You are going to provide inspection and regulatory services concerned with the safe design, construction, installation and maintenance of buildings, mobile homes and specific mechanical, electrical and fuel-fired equipment. That's a big task in its own right. And what about things like smoke detectors? Who will be looking into things like that?

I know that the Federal Government and some national groups are saying that this should be made compulsory. Who will take a look at that? Who will determine what the impact will be in Manitoba?

Who will be looking into questions of new research regarding Workplace Safety and Health, regarding new chemicals, regarding new ways of processing materials?

I don't think that this executive director will be able to carry out all those tasks, unless provided with sufficient support, especially in the research and education area, and administration area. And I haven't been convinced yet by the Minister that the Minister has, in any way, compensated for the fact that she has deleted two very important back-up positions and support staff to those two back-up positions for this new branch.

I think that what will happen is that we are going to have the program thrust emasculated. There will be no general education regarding workplace safety and health in the province. I think the past executive director did a commendable job in meeting with every group that requested the presence of the executive director, to talk about workplace safety and health.

The past executive director travelled extensively through the province, met with companies, met with union locals, met with unorganized groups, provided a wealth of information, and was really trying to, in a sense, promote the program because a lot of people wanted to know what the program was about and what action they could take to better protect themselves against industrial illness and industrial accidents. I predict that that won't happen anymore and I think that's one of the reasons why the executive director resigned. The executive director read between the lines and understood quite clearly that the Minister didn't have a particular interest in this program and was, in fact, squeezing it dry. And that's a fairly simple, effective administrative technique of emasculating a program and that's squeeze it for resources. This is what is happening here in the Workplace Safety and Health Program and I think that most people are very concerned with that.

The Minister indicated that she didn't know why the past executive director resigned. I suggest to her that she received a letter of resignation. I've not seen that letter of resignation but I wonder whether in fact that letter of resignation contains the reasons why the executive director felt it necessary to resign. If the Minister would be willing to table that, I would be interested in receiving it or if she isn't willing to table it, she could at least indicate what the executive director stated

Monday, June 12, 1978

in his letter of resignation regarding his analysis of the program and the direction it was taking. I think that's quite important. I think that the people of Manitoba are concerned that this program will somehow be frozen and squeezed and therefore the Minister certainly can and should provide an explanation as to why the past executive director resigned. She hasn't done so to date and her saying that she is not aware of the reason why the executive director resigned certainly won't wash, especially in the light of the fact that the Minister did receive a letter of resignation from the past director.

I have some concerns about the workload of the present acting director. I don't know what other tasks the present acting executive director of the Workplace Safety and Health Program is undertaking. I do know that the present acting director has a full plate of other responsibilities. I would like the Minister to indicate specifically what other responsibilities the present acting director of Workplace Safety and Health had, whether in fact any of those responsibilities, past responsibilities, have been relieved so that the director can actually undertake the task of carrying out the job of acting director of Workplace Safety and Health with some type of effectiveness.

I would also like the Minister to indicate specifically whether in fact the research that was being done by past people on term contracts regarding research on new chemicals coming out or used in the workplace — and there are a number of new chemicals which come out every year — whether in fact that work has been terminated and will not be done any more so that the people in the workplaces really won't know whether new chemicals that are being used in industrial processes will in fact have some adverse effect on them and could be forewarned rather than having to deal with the matter after it becomes a crisis in the workplace.

So I would like the Minister if she can, to answer some of those specific questions right now and I'll come back to her later because I do understand that she is banking a number of questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Transcona, perhaps while the Minister is getting more detail from her staff people, we could either go on with some other questions until she gets some of that detail given to her. Would the Member for Transcona wish to carry on or should I go on to another member?

MR. PARASIUK: Perhaps you can go on to another member and I'll come back in a few minutes after . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the other day the Members for Selkirk and St. Johns had indicated an interest. I don't believe . . . I just saw the Member for St. Johns leave the room. The Member for Selkirk doesn't appear to be present. Is there anyone else that has . . . the Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Well, I would like to ask the Minister some questions not related to those that were asked by my colleague but it relates to a matter that I was attempting to pursue earlier in the House today and also last week with the Minister of Labour. I think this is a legitimate concern because I'm a little puzzled as to the roles of the Environmental Protection Branch of the government vis-a-vis the Workplace Safety and Health Branch of the Department of Labour. There may be some overlapping, I'm not sure, because I understand, Mr. Chairman, that when you do get spills of chemicals, when you have other problems that affect not only people but the environment, you do have the Environmental Protection Branch staff involved. I recall a few years ago in the City of Brandon there was a danger of some oil leaking and the fumes from this leaking oil in the ground into people's homes and it caused quite a fire scare. This was a couple of years ago. The Environmental Protection Branch staff were there and did a very fine job in inspecting and getting to the root of the problem and trying to clear the matter up. I would imagine, and I don't know specifically, but I would imagine that the Environmental Protection Branch would be involved, let us say at the spill of anhydrous ammonia in the Brandon Industrial Park that occurred a couple of weeks ago or so where the tank car moved and unfortunately there was some type of leakage that occurred and, as we know, the gas having become gas and having proceeded eastward from the city.

So, what I would like to know is whether the Minister who seems to reject the opinion of the gentleman, who I repeat, who I don't know and I've never spoken to or had any communication with, a Mr. Driediger, I believe, whether the Minister — (Interjection)— Ediger? Ediger. You see, I don't even know how to pronounce his name. . . . Whether the Minister — and I don't know whether she saw the program or not but I'm sure it was reported to her of the statements he made — whether she discussed this matter with the deputy, with her own deputy, and whether she discussed it with the executive assistant of the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management because I understand that Minister was out of the province at a meeting, and whether the Minister

felt that the Environmental Protection Branch had no business whatsoever in being involved in this particular matter and whether in her discussions, if she did discuss it with her Deputy, I presume she would have discussed it with her staff, whether she felt that the statement that was made was entirely wrong and entirely inappropriate. The statements related not only to regulations but also to safety conditions and they did provide a number of opinions, the statement included a number of opinions on what could be done, I believe, or perhaps what should be done to improve the situation. So I'm wondering whether the Minister discussed this.

I also wonder whether the Minister or whether the Minister's Deputy, the Deputy Minister of Labour, knew that that person was going on television to answer questions before he actually appeared, because my understanding is that he did obtain permission from his superior who in turn, I understand, received permission of the Deputy Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. And I say I understand because I don't know specifically, I don't know precisely, I don't want to be called a liar again by the Minister of Public Works because in all my statements on this I have repeated statements that have been made to me and I ask this by way of obtaining information and not making an allegation, but could the Minister advise whether her Deputy Minister knew whether this environmental engineer was going on the television program and whether he knew the type of questions that were to be asked of that environmental engineer? And did her Deputy Minister not have any concerns or any objections to him going on the program, if your Deputy Minister knew that he was going on in advance? I don't know; I'm simply asking because having been in government for eight-and-a-half years, I would have said that normally a person going into the public, in television, or in radio, or speaking to anyone in the media, that that person would surely use some prudence and caution and ensure that he had approval of the departments involved, or certainly his superiors, before he would make statements that may be very controversial and get into the political arena.

So I ask that series of questions by means of clarification because I really think that there may be a serious problem here, and the problem being some overlapping of jurisdictions which, I guess, occurred in the past. The only thing, though, with the Workplace Safety and Health Branch, or Division, my understanding was that many of these functions were being brought together in the Department of Labour, personnel being taken from the Department of Health, being taken from the Environmental Protection Department, being brought into one place and trying to do the job of ensuring safety and health conditions not only in the workplace inside but in the workplace outside, and generally in handling such things as chemicals that we have been speaking of.

So I'd like to know whether there was this communication, and I think that's a fair question, and I'd like to know whether the Minister's concerned about perhaps this overlapping of jurisdiction; if we had the Minister of Mines here I would ask him whether he had received a report from his Environmental Protection Branch because I believe that normally speaking they would report on this because it is a matter of damage to the environment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: To the Member for Brandon East, I did see the program that the gentleman in question was on. The Director of the Mechanical and Engineering also saw it. This gentleman that was on is in another branch of the government and he has knowledge in one aspect of environmental studies; we also have our own highly-knowledgeable, highly-expertised people that have been working with the anhydrous ammonia for some time. My Deputy did not know this individual was going on 24 Hours; he has never had any dialogue before or since with this individual. I can't tell you what permission he had from his department because I don't know. I do know that his own Minister was out of town last week, so he didn't have it from him.

I mentioned publicly last Friday that we are having meetings looking into the situation with the Department of Highways, the Department of Agriculture — we have already met with them — and the Department of Mines, now that the Minister is back.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, then as a follow-up to this discussion. You know if I were in the Minister of Labour's place, I would be concerned if I heard a technical opinion — in some cases they may not have been technical opinions, but opinions from people who have certain technical expertise, professional expertise — that somewhat contradicted my understanding and the understanding I would have had from my staff. I would be concerned about that, not as a matter of who is right and who is wrong, but I would like to know from the point of view of contradicting any public statement I would have made. I would like to get to the essence of the matter so that, in my capacity as a Minister, having certain responsibilities to do the right thing, to correct the situation if it at all can be corrected. You know, to move in the right direction. You know, we don't live in a black and white world. There are no black and white answers to most problems, including this one.

So, I wondered then, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could comment on after this statement having

been made, and a rather lengthy statement, I gather, whether her own Deputy Minister and staff have analysed these statements and whether they changed their opinion, at all, on this matter. I gather the Minister said you are now going ahead, proceeding with some sort of a study, or words to that effect. After the program, would not her Deputy Minister want to get in touch with the Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources and Environmental Management to discuss this and ask questions? Not with regard to whether or not that person should have been on TV; that's beside the point. But the opinion offered by someone who has some professional expertise, I would have thought that there would have been some discussion afterwards and whether that would then lead, perhaps, to further discussions, further meetings, between her staff and the staff of that department, with regard to clearing up regulations, perhaps, or changing some regulations perhaps, so that in future we have, to the extent that we can, to the extent that government can do this, have perhaps a lesser chance of accidents happening than previously.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister, to members of the committee, would prefer to follow a format that was started on Friday, when possible banking questions so she can confer with staff people to get answers, and so on.

MR. EVANS: Well, all right, Mr. Chairman, that's fair enough. I would hope, at some point

MR. CHAIRMAN: She's very busy here writing down questions and writing in answers and so on.

MR. EVANS: All right, I can just say then that I think there are many people in this province and particularly in the areas where this material of anhydrous ammonia is being handled, such as in my own constituency, that are concerned about the adequacy of the regulations. I would submit that people are concerned that there may be some confusion with regard to the overlapping of jurisdictions — federal, provincial, municipal — and I think that society, those communities affected — and I daresay the average Manitoban who has taken time out to be read the press, who has taken time out to acquaint himself with the fact that this type of ammonia is being used in greater quantities, greater frequency by the farming community as a fertilizer, that these people would like to think that the government of the day was going to be right on top of the situation and if there is confusion in regulations, to clear up those regulations.

Also, if the regulations as such, if the code as such, because there has been reference to adopting some sort of a national code, there seems to be agreement nationally on how to deal with these types of problems but it seems to me that there is some question as to whether or not Manitoba, in adopting this code, has put itself in a position where it can deal adequately with the problems because it may not have the same regulations, enforcement regulations, that the other provinces have such as Saskatchewan. I compare Saskatchewan because it too uses a lot of this chemical.

It seems to me, from listening to a Ms. or Mrs. Jenny Smythe of the Department of Labour in Saskatchewan, who is involved in Workplace Safety and Health, that according to her comments, Saskatchewan is in a position of effectively dealing with such problems whereas Manitoba is not in that position. Although Manitoba may have adopted a code, nevertheless hasn't taken those steps to put regulations in place to enable the province and the staff, the officials of the department, to deal aggressively and effectively with the problems.

I think there is concern, if you've listened to the CBC radio programs for some mornings last week, I think you would become concerned whether the province is on the bit here, No. 1, whether it's truly concerned about changing whatever it is that has to be changed in order to cope more effectively with the problems and, secondly, to avoid wherever possible confusion that seems to be resulting from different jurisdictions.

Sometimes you can get lost between jurisdictions and quite often nothing may happen because you think that the other jurisdiction is looking after it. For instance, in the case of the railway tank car, you could argue, "Well, look, that's the responsibility of the Board of Transport Commissioners, not the responsibility of the Department of Labour. Or maybe it's the responsibility of the Municipal Fire Department." I don't know. I'm just saying there is a problem and I think a lot of people are concerned that Manitoba isn't being as aggressive in this matter as the Province of Saskatchewan is being.

So I leave that for the Minister's consideration, not only regarding the incident in Brandon, but I'm talking generally now throughout the province, and it seems to me that what is occurring with the increasing use of anhydrous ammonia is that we're going to have more and more farmers, who are the ultimate consumers, transporting this chemical — I think this is where the greatest difficulty may lie in the future — transporting this chemical from regional or area depots where these small

plants are, filling up their own tanks and then transporting these tanks through built-up areas, through towns and whatever, to their farms. I think this is where we may find in the future that there may be more and more accidents simply by virtue of the fact of the numbers of people involved moving this particular chemical. I don't know all the circumstances surrounding the spill or the accident in Killarney, but what I am afraid of is that there may be more accidents in future simply because of the increasing use of it.

So it seems to me that there is some onus on the Department of Labour and if it's not the Department of Labour maybe it's the Environmental Protection Branch; I don't know. But I think there's some onus — or maybe it's the Department of Agriculture — to train farmers in the use, in the transportation and the loading and final utilization of anhydrous ammonia. It seems to me there is some room for improvement in this area. I'm sure a lot of farmers are very competent and capable, they're generally very capable people but that doesn't mean you're expert in every field, and it seems to me that there's some onus on government to ensure that those farmers handling this know what they're doing. Just as you have to know what you are doing when you are driving a car or truck along the road, you have to know what you're doing in dealing with this chemical that can be very lethal in certain circumstances.

So I think the people of Manitoba are looking for some positive action, some aggressive action by the government, and if it isn't by this Minister then some other Minister, either the Minister of Agriculture or perhaps the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. But I think the Minister has been too defensive on the matter and I don't know why, because this problem didn't arise yesterday, it didn't arise since she's become Minister; it's been around a while, the only thing is, it's growing. And the other thing of course is that she is the Minister responsible for this new Workplace Safety and Health legislation. So I'm not suggesting that all of a sudden it came up and you are supposed to magically find all the solutions; I'm not suggesting that. And I would also submit, with all respect, that there's no need to be overly defensive about this. I think what there is need for, though, is to acknowledge the seriousness of it and say, "Okay, there is a problem, so let's get on with the job. Let's see how we can tackle it." You don't expect to resolve everything overnight, but let's acknowledge there's a problem. Let's not say, "Oh, the companies are doing a good job of training and therefore it's probably okay," or "We've got some regulations in this department," or "We've got the very good Fire Department," and so on. I think there's no need to be defensive. I think we all recognize it's not an ideological thing, it's a thing of adequate handling and safety. And let's recognize there's a problem and let's see what we can do to reduce the risks. And having said that, I realize that it doesn't matter what you do you're going to have accidents and there's people going to be hurt. No matter how often the Fire Department of a particular municipality may go around every year and inspect homes and suggest to the homeowners various ways and means of keeping their place in order so that fires will not be given a chance to start; no matter how often they do this I'm sure there will still be fires, for whatever reason. Accidents do occur; that's life. So I repeat, I don't see why the Minister needs to be overly defensive about this. I think what she should do is say, "We're going to get on with it; we're going to see what Saskatchewan is doing," or any province. And if they are doing something better than us, by golly, we're going to get on there and we're going to improve ours so that nobody can take a back seat to the Province of Manitoba in handling this chemical or any other dangerous chemical, or any other workplace safety and health hazards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. DON ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To follow up some of the comments that the Member for Brandon East has made regarding the product anhydrous ammonia, I have just recently put together some information on the state of the industry, you might say, in terms of safety procedures and methods on anhydrous ammonia. I think it might be of interest to members of the Committee to have some of this information put on the record.

An example of the increase in use of anhydrous ammonia, to give you an idea of the type of increase we have seen in the last eight years, in Manitoba in 1969 approximately 1,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia were used. I haven't got 1977 figures, nor do I have 1978 figures, but the last complete year I have is 1976, which is a time period of seven years, and the use in 1976 was in excess of 30,000 tons. The projections for last year are roughly 40,000 tons and probably more ammonia used this year than last year, possibly as high as 45,000 to 50,000 tons. I think the Member for Brandon East alluded to a very basic concept in here, that no matter what you do you're going to have accidents, no matter how your regulations are set up, etc. etc., you're always running the risk of accidents. And I think some of the usage statistics that I've got here — and these, I think, would be quite accurate — would indicate that not only do you run the risk of having an accident in normal use of the product, but in this particular product we have got an increase in use, quite a rapid increase in use in terms of total tonnage of the material. And one of the very difficult things to rationalize in the anhydrous ammonia industry is the fact that anhydrous

ammonia primarily is used in one short four-to-six week period; it's always in the spring and despite the fact that you have very safe equipment and you have very safe procedures, I don't think that you can possibly have regulations which are going to eliminate accidents in the ammonia business because you've got people in the industry whose total yearly livelihood depends on that short six-week period, and when they're running 18 hours and even more per day, seven days a week, to service their customers who need the product, they get tired, and no matter how carefully they have been briefed and how much safety training they have taken, their tendency to make mistakes increases, and that's an unfortunate fact of the industry.

I don't like to see accidents in ammonia. I don't like to see accidents in any form but I think we have to caution excessive criticism and temper it with the realization that the ammonia industry is one of rapidly increasing use and a very compressed season, which unfortunately, with the type of product you are using, may lead to an increase in accidents. But I think from 1969 to 1976 we have a 30-fold increase in the amount of product used; I very much doubt if we have had a 30-fold increase in accidents. I would have no hesitation in saying that. So I think per se, in terms of the increase in usage of physical quantities, I think the accident record has been quite good, has been quite good over the last few years.

Now to give you an example of some of the things that are going on in the ammonia industry right now, there's an association which covers Western Canada, The Western Canadian Fertilizer Association. They have for the last year been developing under the guidance of primarily Alberta where ammonia has been in use of for a greater number of years at greater usage. For instance, in 1976, ammonia usage in Alberta was in excess of 90,000 tons, so they're / tripleuse in Manitoba, they've had a lot more experience. It's in conjunction with the fertilizer associations of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta that The Western Canadian Fertilizer Association has developed an anhydrous ammonia maintenance and safety program, and this particular manual is designed to promote safety in the anhydrous ammonia industry throughout all levels of usage: manufacturing plant, transportation industry, dealership distributorship level plus farm usage level.

Saskatchewan has the least usage in anhydrous ammonia of any province and they have I think within the last 12 months brought in regulations and require dealers in anhydrous ammonia to be licensed. I have been informed that the licensing and testing and certification of anhydrous ammonia dealers involves use of the Western Canadian Fertilizer Association Anhydrous Ammonia Maintenance and Safety Program per se with very few exceptions, so that gives us you an example of the type of safety program the industry has developed. They are willing to certify and license their dealers on the basis of the testing procedure developed by the WCFA.

Now the ammonia industry as gentlemen opposite and most people studying it know is quite highly regulated in terms of equipment and distances and the Minister left us with some of the information the other day in the department research. In all fairness to the industry, I believe that there are sufficient regulations in place in terms of equipment specifications and safety procedures, that the regulations are far and wide probably sufficient. As a matter of fact I would say if all the regulations are followed as presented, they are sufficient to give us a safe anhydrous ammonia industry, but overriding that and causing some of the problems is the increase in usage, number one and number two, the compressed season and the greater incidence of human error when you're running on a tight schedule as most fertilizer dealers serving Western Canada do.

Now, further to the Western Canada Fertilizer Association, this safety manual has been under authorship for the last six or eight months and will be officially presented in the very near future, but it won't substantially change from the material that Saskatchewan has been using in terms of their licensing procedure and it won't change in content from the material that the various major distributors in Manitoba have been using in conducting safety seminars for their dealers and for their farm customers.

Now, one supplier in Manitoba has a standard regulation. They present a training course to the distributors in anhydrous ammonia and their training course involves the use of this safety manual as complete as it is. They have a slide presentation which is approximately 120 slides and it shows all aspects of the ammonia business including some of the detrimental effects of ammonia if it's allowed to escape, how to prevent different types of situations which may develop in the escape of ammonia, how to safely handle the product. These seminars are put on by safety personnel who are expert in the field of handling anhydrous ammonia and all their dealers are required to take this course. It's not something that a dealer can opt out of, it's required by the supplier that the dealers take this course. At the end of completion of the course, they are given a test and following the test, a certificate of proficiency as their comprehension of anhydrous ammonia business per se has increased through presentation of the manual.

The truckers hauling the product for this particular supplier have been given instructions that if they come to unload at an unsafe location, in other words, say a location where there's no safety water available, or say it's in the fall and the water is frozen or there's hoses that are question mark, or something within the equipment of the actual facility that they're not 100 percent certain

Monday, June 12, 1978

is not going to cause them problems, their truckers who contract haul for them are given the instructions to turn around and come home and not to unload if the trucker himself believes his safety will be endangered in unloading at that site.

Apparently Paul's Hauling in Brandon has quite a comprehensive training course and it was developed by Paul's Hauling as I understand it, independent of the maintenance and safety program that Western Canadian Fertilizer Association has developed, and Paul's Hauling program according to this particular supplier was a very very competent one, so that the supplier is very confident that Paul's as a trucking firm are very aware of the product they're handling and are going to handle it with the utmost safety. The Paul's Hauling course apparently involves films and tape presentations as to how to properly handle anhydrous ammonia.

Now, this supplier over the past several months has held safety seminars dealing strictly with anhydrous ammonia, and just to give you an example of some of them, there was an ammonia safety meeting at Dauphin, Manitoba February 23, 1977. It was attended by quite a group of people, some 30 or so I would suppose, or maybe 40, and they were dealers, interested farmers, members of the Dauphin Fire Department, members of the RCMP, members of the Dauphin City Council, members of Manitoba Hydro, members of the media, members of CNR; it involved a wide range of dealers, customers, transportation people, fire department people, council people and RCMP. One was held in Brandon February 21, 1977 and basically the same type of people were there. There were dealers, RCMP, fire commissioners, office representatives, Trimac representatives, Brandon Fire Department, Brandon City Police, RCMP, CP Rail, Brandon General Hospital, Cyprus River Fire Department, RCMP, Virden, Rosssburn, Shoal Lake, Souris, Deloraine, Brandon, Virden; Metropolitan Investigation and Security were there, Brandon EMO were there, representatives of Goodall Rubber, CNR, CP Rail, Safety Supply Company and the Department of Labour were all in attendance at that seminar and there was a seminar held at Neepawa - I already mentioned that one I guess, no, I didn't, that was Dauphin - Neepawa, February 22, 1977. Once again dealers, RCMP, Neepawa Fire Department, CP Investigations Department, Goodall Rubber, Safety Supply were in attendance at that meeting. One held March 3, 1977, Carman; there were dealers there, Treherne Fire Department, RCMP from Carman, UGG, CP Rail, and Safety Supply, Trimac as the hauler. And in the spring of 1978 there were safety seminars also held at Kenton with approximately 50 to 60 people in attendance; a safety seminar held in Winkler where there were 150 to 160 people in attendance and there has been apparently various . . . held at 4-H Club meetings where there have been 40 to 50 people in attendance. There was a fire officers' safety school under the direction of a Mr. Griner with 100 fire officers from throughout the province attending and apparently — and I'm not certain on these — but I believe I understand that on June 14th, 1978 which is upcoming, there will be a seminar of 25 RCMP officers to be held at Simplot Chemicals Plant and on June 20th, 1978, a safety seminar with nurse tank manufacturers in Winnipeg.

Now, I just thought it would be quite interesting or quite appropriate at this time so that maybe the impression doesn't get left through the media or through any other source that the industry itself is not interested in safety in handling of anhydrous ammonia. I think I can say with all honesty and from personal experience that safety is of the utmost importance within the fertilizer industry and in particular within the anhydrous ammonia industry. I was involved with it myself for some five years in Alberta and ammonia was a fledgling industry out there and going through growing pains, where we had to settle a number of questions regarding regulations, equipment, etc. Any industry is going to continue to have growing pains and regulation difficulties and there is no doubt about it that no matter how you regulate an industry, you're not going to regulate 100 percent safety because you always have the factor of human error.

Just as a follow-up, I think it's quite interesting that there were letters of commendation come in to this particular company, who had held these safety seminars that I just mentioned, and there are several letters of commendation from various people, from CP Rail, from the Carman RCMP, from the Department of Agriculture, from the Dauphin Fire Department commending the course as being very informative and well presented, "Film presentations were excellent and it gives a firefighter or operator an idea of what he is up against in case of a spill and how to cope with the problem."

So, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that there are some very, I think, very good safety standards developed and currently in use in the anhydrous ammonia industry in the province. It is unfortunate that we do have accidents which periodically occur in the handling of the product, but I think I can say with all confidence that the industry is adhering to very good codes. They are three different levels of codes that the industry has to follow. They provide a very good degree of safety within the industry. The companies, the fertilizer suppliers themselves, through the Western Canadian Fertilizer Association, have developed a very comprehensive safety manual for anhydrous ammonia and are moving very firmly and very quickly towards promoting a very safe industry in anhydrous ammonia.

So, with those few remarks, I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet, then Transcona. Oh, the Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Yes, just a very short question of the Member for Pembina. Does he have any information on what the . . . I appreciate that companies have these programs that the member speaks of, but I was just wondering, do they have anything for farmers per se, I mean, are they actively giving courses to farmers — courses, maybe that's not the word — you know, films, slides, and brochures to farmers and so on? I mean, what is being done for farmers as such as opposed to, like the dealers or the handlers at the little plants?

MR. ORCHARD: As I understand it, all these meetings were advertised as open meetings and the dealers themselves would encourage their customers to come to them, but whether the farmer comes or not, there's no compulsion to come but there are a number of farmers at these various meetings and they have gone to 4-H Clubs, which are primarily farm oriented for presentation of the material. The meeting at Winkler — I can only guess here — but with 150 to 160 people attending a meeting at Winkler, there's not that many ammonia dealers in all of Manitoba so there had to be a high degree of farmer representation there. Farmers always were and I assume always will be encouraged to come to these meetings to appreciate some of the hazards and some of the safety procedures involved in the product.

Depending on the type of handling system that the farmer himself uses, I know in the system that I've used at home where a delivery unit delivers the product to you, truck-mounted delivery, my instructions have always been from the driver of that delivery unit that if I have any problems to walk away from the machine, do not attempt to solve anything and phone them and don't tamper with the machine at all. That's advice that I learned from experience in the industry you follow. I fully expect that most farmers do follow that in those situations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Pembina has indicated that we haven't had too many accidents and I would be interested to know just how many we have had, if any, and the nature of them. But I would like to leave with the committee my personal feeling about this problem and that is that if there is one serious accident, it will be one too many, if it's caused because of a lack of understanding of the product or the methods of handling it, if there's a lack of information flowing from either the private or public sector with respect to how to handle this kind of product. I would hope that we don't have to face that situation but I would hope that the Minister would undertake to make certain that that is not within the realm of probability.

I would like to know specifically whether there are standard procedures that are employed under given circumstances and I can cite just some possible examples. The derailment of a railway tank car carrying the product in a town or village, or anywhere for that matter, but in particular near a town or a village, is there a standard procedure to deal with that kind of emergency situation? Likewise, an accident involving two vehicles one of which would be carrying the product. What is the rule, regulation, law? Perhaps the Minister might enlighten us as to what kind of contingency arrangements we do have for those possible situations.

The other question, I think it's probably where the high risk factor is although I would be pleased to learn otherwise and that is to the extent that there are rapid increases in utilization or use of this product on the farm, which means that more farm people are involved, that through their ignorance they don't get caught in a serious accident or whatever and would it not make sense or perhaps it has already been done, I don't know, to require that anyone using the product or handling the product be licensed under The Fertilizer and Pesticide Control Act. It might be worthwhile to look at that —(Interjection)— Yes, just from the point of view of making sure that the necessary information is brought to them with respect to how they should handle this product for their own safety. I believe we have a Board and perhaps they have looked at this and made recommendations. But I would be interested to know whether they have, the Fertilizer and Pesticide Control, the Board under the Control Act just passed a couple of years ago. That might be a body that could take a look at this and work along with the Department of Labour and the industry people to make certain that all things that should be done are done, in terms of public interest, by both private individuals and the government through the Department of Labour and Agriculture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I must begin by saying that I find it quite astonishing that we have to get answers on the whole matter of anhydrous ammonia from an MLA, a backbench MLA, rather

Monday, June 12, 1978

than —(Interjection)— Well, I thank him for providing us with some of the answers, not all of the answers, but I must note that he is not the Minister responsible; he doesn't have the responsibility for this area, and if he wants to do it on his own time, fine. I guess this is another example of volunteer effort. However, we have asked the Minister responsible for this issue to provide us with answers. We asked two weeks ago, last week, the week before; we've asked for information from the Minister responsible; she has a department, she has a branch, and we have not received clear-cut answers on this whole matter from the Minister. We received a report that the Minister tabled from Mr. O'Morrow, Director of Mechanical and Engineering Division, to Mr. King, Deputy Minister, and the Minister was kind enough to send this over to us, but this deals with only the mechanical and engineering aspects of anhydrous ammonia, didn't raise many of the other issues, in points of fact, that the Member for Pembina dug up, I think in talking to some of the industry spokesmen. At the same time, although I thank the Member for Pembina for raising this, giving us this information, there are a number of questions which my colleague, the Member for Lac du Bonnet has raised, for example, and at this stage I don't even know who to address them to. If we address them to the Minister of Labour she will bank those and we might not get an answer, or we'll get an incomplete answer. Or should we now sort of make the Member for Pembina the Acting Minister of anhydrous ammonia or the Acting Minister of Labour and we can ask the Acting Minister of Labour to give us some accurate answers. I think from past performance we can probably rely more on the Member for Pembina to provide us with detailed answers regarding all facets of the issue of anhydrous ammonia, because we haven't been able to get them so far.

And the point is, we were assured by the Minister of Labour that frankly she had sufficient capability within her own department to provide answers to a lot of pressing questions regarding anhydrous ammonia that have been raised not only by myself and my colleague, the Member for Brandon East, other people as well, and that frankly, people who might have commented on this issue from another department didn't have expertise in this particular area. I don't know whether in fact the Minister of Labour would say that the Member for Pembina should be disregarded because he's not a certified expert in the area and that she herself has certified experts within her own department who are the only ones who can comment on this, because when we had a Mr. e Ediger from the Department of Mines and Environmental Review raise concerns about this, the Minister just dismissed his comments as not being that of an expert. Well, I think I'm satisfied to get information, documented information, from all sources. I thank the Member for Pembina for providing us with the information, which I'll be able to read up in and check again in Hansard when Hansard comes out. I am wondering if the Acting Minister of Labour would be in a position — or, sorry, the Acting Minister of anhydrous ammonia would be in a position to get copies of that manual to us so that we could read up on that ourselves. If the Minister, sorry, if the Acting Minister of anhydrous ammonia is satisfied that all groups involved in anhydrous ammonia have sufficient training, have the various police detachments in the province where anhydrous ammonia is being used, have all these police detachments received some training? Is the Acting Minister of anhydrous ammonia in a position to answer that? Or, if the Acting Minister of anhydrous ammonia isn't in a position to answer that, would the Minister of Labour undertake to find out whether in fact that is so?

Do all the distributors have training? Have all the distributors received training or is it just the distributors who relate to one particular supplier? Are there any distributors in Manitoba who have not received training and passed this particular course that is required? Is there any way of testing whether in fact people haven't just attended the training session as a lark, but rather have in fact received knowledge? Is there any type of testing at the end of the seminars to determine that people pass them or fail them? As I said, I will check with Hansard again, but I am not sure whether in fact I should be addressing this to the Acting Minister of anhydrous ammonia or the Minister of Labour. But these are still questions that are left hanging. —(Interjection)— Well, we intend to vote you your salary; we may in fact suggest that it be split up between those people who produce and those people who don't. I think that we should reward those that produce and not reward those that don't produce. —(Interjection)— No, it certainly has happened; yes. —(Interjection)— But do you mean to say that we should sort of prop up someone who isn't producing? Is that what you're implying? Is that what the Member for Minnedosa is implying, that we should prop up someone who isn't producing? Is that what you said just now when you were heckling? — (Interjection)— No, no; I didn't say anything. You have been the one heckling and suggesting . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Member for Transcona continue to address his remarks through the Chair, please.

MR. PARASIUKE: I have some difficulty because I have these suggestions coming forward from members opposite, and if they want to put them on record, they can stand up and do so, but when they heckle then I feel that I should at least, Mr. Chairman, indicate to those present and have put in the record why I am being heckled and what type of sage advice I am receiving from the

Acting Minister of financial institutions.

MR. BLAKE: Oh my gosh. You've got to be something else.

MR. PARASIUK: I just want you to participate, I just want you to participate; if you want, you can join in.

MR. DRIEDGER: And when you get answers, you don't listen to them.

MR. PARASIUK: I have tried to very hard, and I thanked him, and I think that the Member for Pembina has provided us with about five times more information than the Minister of Labour did, and that's the point that we're discussing. We're discussing a budget here, a budget item of \$2.4 million; we're being requested to vote money of \$2.4 million with respect to Workplace Safety and Health and we can't get answers. We can't get answers. The Acting Director, the Acting Executive Director of the Workplace Safety and Health Branch hasn't provided the answers, hasn't vouched this; we have received something from a person called O'Morrow; it doesn't deal with the whole issue of anhydrous ammonia. That's a big issue. We're being asked to provide \$2.4 million and we can't get information and neither can other people who have asked questions about anhydrous ammonia. And in all seriousness, I thank the Member for Pembina; I hope he'll provide some of that written information to me so that I could look at it as well.

And then I think he's provided us with some information, but the information he has provided does raise other questions, and the point is, who then do we follow up with on these questions? The Acting Minister for anhydrous ammonia has said "Pay us \$15,600" and he will answer these questions. Maybe, in fact, that's a valid suggestion. In fact, I think we should think about making a motion to that effect if in fact the present Minister of Labour can't provide those types of answers, maybe we should get a Minister of Labour who can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona knows very well that that type of motion is completely out of order and I think he should stick to the subject, that the opposition does not have the power to nominate salaries to individuals; the government decides that. So that

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak to that point of order. I didn't make the motion; I made that as a suggestion. What's his point of order?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, we've sat here and listened to him call people Minister of this, Minister of that, and I think that if he is in seriousness concerned about the \$2.4 million, which we all are, that he sticks with the subject and deals with it, rather than call names across the table.

MR. PARASIUK: I haven't called any names. I've done so with the greatest degree of respect, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what the point of order was or is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There isn't really a point of order, although he did bring out an important fact that the opposition cannot make such motions, but there wasn't a motion made, it was just a suggestion by the Member for Transcona.

MR. USKIW: Therefore everyone that has spoken since the Member for Transcona is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona has the floor.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The point that I was trying to raise is that workplace safety and health is a very important issue. We are considering the Estimates; we have been told that the department has sufficient resources to deal with all the issues at hand; we have one that's topical at present, anhydrous ammonia, and we have not received sufficient answers. We just haven't received enough information on this issue, and we have someone else coming out of the blue, in

a sense, with information which I think was good, was useful and was valid, but that still raises the question, why couldn't we get it from the department? And I have suggested before, and I will raise this again, that I think that the Executive Director of that branch is overloaded. I don't think the Executive Director saw this particular memo which went up from Mr. O'Morrow to Mr. King, because I think the Executive Director, or the Acting Executive Director, would have taken a look at this and said, "Gee, you know, this particular memo of June 8th doesn't in fact answer a number of questions which are valid." What about the other groups? What about the Fire Departments? What about the Police Departments? What about the Emergency Measures Organization? And I think that the material that the Member for Pembina has provided does in fact provide some answers to those types of questions, and I think that that's valid, and I'm glad that I received that material. But I'm somewhat puzzled as to why I couldn't get it from the department and I'm suggesting that the Executive Director of this branch be given sufficient resources to carry out the job properly so that when you get into a complicated area like anhydrous ammonia, or any other such area, that you can take a look at the various aspects of the problem, not just the mechanical and engineering aspects but the other aspects, look at it from the perspective of society as a whole. It may be that the distributors and handlers know how to deal with it, but it may be that if in fact there is a railroad car derailed, or if there is an accident, that the community itself should know how to cope with it.

You know, I understood what the member said when he said that we have a number of — this is the Member for Pembina — the Member for Pembina said that a number of these people dealing in the area are working 18 hours a day, and they do so very intensively for a period of four to six weeks, and in that situation it may be that human error will be increased, when these people are overworked and overtired. Now, the question is, should there not be some regulation by the department as to what would constitute a normal workday, because the point is you could say, "Well, we shouldn't regulate that, we shouldn't regulate that; we shouldn't have a limit of 14 hours or 12 hours," and people can snicker on the other side, but what happens then if someone has worked for 16 hours or 18 hours and there is an accident that affects not that person, but the rest of the community, and that's what you don't understand, that if something like this is being handled in the community, and it is highly volatile and dangerous, that it affects the entire community, it just doesn't affect that one person.

And I think that's a critical issue, and I think that's something the department should address itself to.

I don't know if the Emergency Measures Organization has a contingency plan; I don't know if those types of procedures have been worked out. We still don't have answers. The Member for Lac du Bonnet has raised some very valid questions from the community perspective. So I can appreciate that maybe those people directly involved will suffer the consequences if in fact they have a human error because they are overtired, but what happens to the rest of the community? Is that a sufficient excuse saying, "Well, you know, it's an intensive type of a job where we're working 18 hours a day for four to six weeks and, you know, I'm sorry about this but we did have that accident and that person may in fact have suffered the consequences."

But what about the rest of the community? That's something that hasn't been dealt with yet and I think properly should be looked at and the question that arises: Who should do the prompting? Who should define the problems within the Department of Labour, within the branch of Workplace Safety and Health, so that these various facets to the problem are examined? I would suggest that it's the executive director who should do that. The executive director in consultation with the various people in the branch who have particular specific expertise to offer but it should be the executive director who synthesizes the material, partly in the manner in which the Member for Pembina has synthesized the material and presented it, so you can define the problem in overall terms, the specific components of it, and then determine whether in fact you've got specific action to deal with specific components of the problem and then to determine whether, in a general overall sense, you are satisfied that reasonable and sufficient precautions exist with respect to the handling of anhydrous ammonia and the use of anhydrous ammonia within the entire province. I think that that is something that we still have not been able to receive a specific enough answer from the Minister on and that's why, I think, we have some very grave concerns.

To point out a specific that the Member for Pembina raised. He talked about Paul's Hauling having some very good procedures in place and I understand that that is true, they do have them but I understand also that one of the reasons why they have these procedures in place is because the Federal Department of Labour inspector who checked out that accident in Brandon found that a number of those people hadn't received training in dealing. There was a fatal accident in Brandon involving Paul's . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the members of the committee, in accordance with Rule 19(2) and the hour of 4:30 having arrived, I'm interrupting proceedings of the committee for Private Members' Hour.

Monday, June 12, 1978

We will return at 8:00 o'clock.m .

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY
SUPPLY — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: I would direct the honourable members to Page 42 under the Estimates of Health and Social Development. We are on Resolution No. 63, Clause 7. Corrective and Rehabilitative Services, (b)(2) Other Expenditures—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that we had passed 78.(b) the last time this was before us, that we were actually on (c) Probation and Parole Services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I see no point to argue with my honourable friend. If he wants (b)(2) passed, we are perfectly willing to accept that and as far as I'm concerned we can be on (c) immediately if that's what my honourable friend desires, but I was under the impression that we had just passed (b)(1).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well perhaps the weekend dulled my memory, but I thought we had passed these two items. It's interesting to note in passing, Mr. Chairman, that the present administration by combining (a) and (b) which is really what has occurred by having the Minister's responsibility transferred to the Minister of Health, that they have combined the two items and increased the expenditure by roughly 8.54 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess we'd better go right to (c) then. Item (c)(1) Salaries—pass — The the Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was just on my feet for a minute to respond to the last comment of the Honourable Meer for Winnipeg Centre. I wanted to ask him whether that comment was made in reference to 63, 7.(b)(2) because I didn't quite hear the introduction to his remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, where there was a Ministry in this department responsible for Corrective and Rehabilitative Services, if you add the \$50,900 for that office and for the Executive Function, the two are really combined in the former administration. If you add the two items the \$50,900 and \$280,600 and add 8.5 percent you'll come up with \$359,800 that the present administration is asking for for this function.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the office of the Inspector General is now included in here too, so that accounts for a substantial portion of the difference.

MR. BOYCE: Perhaps the Ministe could advise the House and the people of the province just exactly what's involved in the office of the Inspector General.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the office of the Inspector General is responsible for carrying out regular inspections and audits of the various components of the Provincial Adult and Juvenile Correctional and Probation Services systems. That includes management of the administrative security operational procedural land program components. They are measured against standards developed by the Ministry in co-operation with other provincial jurisdictions and the federal jurisdiction. The Inspector General is also charged with investigating extraordinary situations, serious escapes and disturbances reported irregularities, potential crises, emergency situations and complaints from ministry field staff, complaints from inmates and the public concerning systems operations and procedures. The role and function is not a duplication of that of the provincial Oudsman because the Correctional Inspector General is concerned only with related areas of ministerial responsibility and he makes his report direct to the Minister or Deputy Minister.

MR. BOYCE: Well perhaps the Minister could advise the House, who is in this position and how someone may contact him if they have a question relative to corrections?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Inspector General is Mr. Eric Cox. I don't have his phone number right in front of me but he is listed in the Provincial Government Telephone Directory under Office of the Inspector General, under the Ministries Divisional Headings, or he would also be reachable through the office of the Deputy Minister, Dr. John Banman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, in leaving this item that we can better dig into them line by line as the service is provided by the Ministry or the department come before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable member be making reference to going back to Section (b)?

MR. BOYCE: We're on (r)(1), Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1) all right. (c)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could explain whether the arrangements between the parole service, the federal service and the provincial probation service up north has been terminated and why.

MR. SHERMAN: No, that has not been terminated, Mr. Chairman.

MR. AXWORTHY: Perhaps the Minister could provide more elaboration. Is it true then that the federal service still pays a fee to the Provincial Government and utilizes the services of those officers in northern Manitoba in their full facilities?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, that's correct. That situation still is in effect, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, on Parole and Probation Services, I would like the Minister to advise us of this, number one, the total number of staff man years that were allocated to this function in total for this current fiscal year and the last fiscal year, and also the disposition of this staff by region. The Member for Fort Rouge asked a very important question because there is not only a need for services for Manitobans relative to Manitoba court system but nevertheless there exists an agreement with the Federal Government to provide this service. So, while the staff is providing this information to the Minister perhaps I could ask these questions and the staff can provide the Minister with the information.

I was pleased to hear the Minister's general remarks that he has time to find out that my expression that we had a system in Manitoba that was second to none, that the Minister substantiated that in his remarks on Friday, in a total system, and specifically with reference to this particular area, Mr. Chairman, Manitoba in many regards was avant-garde. It once again is one of the areas that gets little public attention until something goes awry and then everybody seems to jump on it. But the programs that I would like the Minister to advise the House on what is contemplated in asking for the funds relative to this item, or the Voluntary Probation Officer Program, the short-term high impact alternative; the placement programs and the Remand Attendance Program; and the Non-judicial Screening Program' some of which were contemplated and some initiated under the prior administration.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the staff man years for Probation and Parole Services, the total for 1977-78 was 170, and it's unchanged for 1978-79, 170.

The services familiar to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, of course, provides Field Resources and Program Supervision; and it covers Winnipeg as well as rural Manitoba.

The Winnipeg Probation staff including clericals is 79 and rural Manitoba, including clericals is 59.

On the Volunteer Probation Service, Mr. Chairman, we're looking at special use of course of community volunteer probation officers, 51 honorary probation officers in Winnipeg, 40 in rural centres, 12 operating in Winnipeg as 1 to 1 volunteers, so that's a total in the volunteer probation officers' service, of 103. The total clients served, 261.

Monday, June 12, 1978

I don't know whether the honourable member wants me to place on the record the specific functions of volunteer probation officers, or whether he just wants a response to his question as to how the program is working. My experience to date and my advice from my department officials is that it is working effectively and that it provides an extremely necessary component in the investigation and tutoring and supervisory and counselling areas of the Corrections field and also gives us an insurance that certain conditions or court orders are met, that would otherwise perhaps be hard to meet. It certainly demonstrates — and has demonstrated — its worth and its value.

The honourable member asked me about the short-term high impact program, which I may need a minute on. Thank you. The total allocated for this program in 1977-78, Mr. Chairman, was \$25,000.00. The total costs of the projects approved to date, \$15,900.00. The projects approved to date include two in Eastman, Norway House and Oxford House. These involve the employment of a local community worker to develop, in some cases, special recreation activities for probationers; in some cases, basic skills training and group recreational activities. One in Westman, at Brandon, hiring a field worker to serve two groups of adult probationers with employment problems; one in Norman, at Moose Lake — this is a life skills program directed at Prevention of Solvent and Drug Abuse, 9 to 12 probationers; two in Parklands Region, both in Dauphin, one consisting of a Provincial Workshop on Restitution and Reconciliation, citizen activities and planning and the other one in Dauphin composed of a Restitution and Reconciliation worker, and work in the field of Victim Confrontation and Work Restitution. This particular service dealt with 30 cases over a one-year period.

That's six projects and there are two others. One is the Central Juvenile Unit, a community work order project and involves one field worker to organize reconciliation activities for property Offenders and Victims. So far 25 to 30 cases processed. And the other one is in Central Region, Portage la Prairie. It's a 2 ½ month Summer Activity Prevention Program reaching 20 to 40 pre-delinquent and delinquent children. This is jointly funded by STEP, community donations and the Children's Aid Societies. Our share of the operational costs is \$1,500.00. That's the hort . S/ Term High Impact Program, Mr. Chairman.

I'm not sure whether the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre wants me to sit down at the moment while he either comments further on those, or whether he'd like me to continue with responses to the general range of questions that he gave me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I was sitting there listening to the Minister and I kind of empathize with the Minister, and I really find it difficult to hammer him, because he has been under pressure here for the last couple of weeks on Health Estimates and it is a huge and large department. So for the Minister not to be better briefed on what is actually happening in this particular area, does not come as a surprise.

I suppose there is some personal concern in it, having been the Minister in this area before. The government deliberately made a decision to establish a separate Ministry within the department, a little too late for my liking, nevertheless they made the decision. This particular area was transferred holus-bolus from the Attorney-General's department, prior to 1969, and it didn't get that much attention from the former government until two or three years ago.

The Minister has just demonstrated the need for more attention in this particular area especially when we're talking about probations and dealing with people who do come in conflict with the law, without bringing the whole weight of the penal system to bear. In this particular area, we are dealing not only with adult offenders, we are dealing with youngsters, to a large degree.

It was interesting to note last night on one of the local TV channels, CKY, where they dealt with some of the ramifications of the American involvement in Vietnam, in which they report that 35 percent of the penal population in the United States were people who returned from that experience and over half-a-million of them are involved in some kind of psychiatric treatment. But here we are dealing with an item which hopefully will deploy people who can assist people who have some difficulty. I use these people that have returned from Vietnam as an example.

The Minister, in his introductory remarks on Friday, pointed out that the society is getting more irritated, is becoming more violent and restless, many other terms could be used. The question arises: What do we do to protect ourselves — if we will — if a person wants to look at it from that aspect? Because in allocating moneys for this kind of involvement, people should realize that there is a self-interest involved. It's an investment to save money in the future.

Having been involved peripherally with people on probation, and every once in awhile some of these people who have been assisted by this particular group of people, contact me and they are married and having families, and the rest of it. They have learned to live in a society and to cope with it.

But the Minister has told us so far — and the only reason I am speaking at the present time is so that he can get some more information — is that he has told us that he has asked for 170 staff man years. I thought it was 164 last year, but we may have increased it. It has slipped by and there may have been some term positions that I was unaware of. But he is asking for 170, and I find difficulty in reconciling this with his comments on Friday in the general area, where he is anticipating an increased workload. The staff advised that they had a caseload of 40, on a weighted basis. They play little games as, so many of these make so many of that. And I wonder if this is going to necessitate an increase in the workload.

Because if it is, Mr. Chairman, here again we have the Minister telling us, (1), that there is no horror story in this particular area; (2), there is no fat, there is no waste; and (3), that he is cutting services. Because if he intends to deal with more people with less staff, then it is, in fact, the cutting of services.

So perhaps the Minister could advise us as to the relationship between, you know, such indices as arrests for the last fiscal year and the projections for this fiscal year, as to involvements before the court, at which time the probation people will be involved, in one way or another.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the staff man years, the honourable member is correct that at one point last year it was 164, but there were six additional who were approved by Management Committee during the year, on term, and they have been renewed and that's what accounts for the total of 170 this year. So Those six additional SMYs were authorized during the fiscal year 1977-78 for probation workers, who were formerly new careerists with probation services — five of them in rural Manitoba and one of them in Metro Winnipeg.

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre asked me about placement and, as far as placement is concerned, we are looking at group home placement, as well as children's institutions. The month-to-month variance in group home placements from January through May of this year ranges from 51, as the number in placement in January, to 33, as the number in placement in May. The number of homes used have been pretty constant — either 14 or 15 throughout that five-month period in this calendar year. The average juvenile placement looked at in terms of those particular homes has ranged from 3.4, which was a high in January, to 2.3 in May.

In terms of increases in load or capacity, or population that our service is dealing with, there has been an increase of three percent, I am advised, in the juvenile field, in referrals. It has been less than that in the adult field. So that although our total institutional populations are substantially up, as a universal figure, over what they were five or six years ago, we are not looking in 1978-79, at this juncture anyway, at an appreciably or significantly expanded workload or caseload for the personnel in the programs and services of this Ministry.

Let me just deal with the other two subjects tt the honourable member raised a minute or two ago, Mr. Chairman, in the area of remand and attendance and the non-judicial screening program. Remand supervision — that operates for up to 20 juveniles. It is provided by daily contact with those juveniles, their families and school officials, where appropriate, in accordance with a Remand Attendance Centre Order. The Attendance Centre for up to 40 juveniles provides intensive supervision and programming in lieu of the juvenile being committed or placed.

Those two programs, or program areas, the Remand and Attendance Sections include group programs that range through educational, recreational and counselling categories, that include individual counselling, family counselling and supervisory activity, and that include the monitoring of attendance at school and curfews, where appropriate.

The Non-judicial Screening Program, I can only report that the program is proceeding and certainly has my endorsement and my officials' endorsement. I recognize the rationale for it and the justification for it. It's really an extension of a long established working agreement between the correctional system and the provincial training institutions. The Corrections Act provides the authority, delegated by the Attorney-General, for the probation service of the province to screen referrals of juveniles from the various police departments to decide whether they ought to be formally charged in court, or be handled without appearing before a judge, and that's where the program goes into effect. In those cases in which the offence is a minor one or the situation is such that an appearance before the court would be not in the best interest of the juvenile or society, the Probation Service makes provision, Mr. Chairman, for the manner to be handled non-judicially.

Approximately one-third of all juvenile referrals — from 3,500 to 4,000 juveniles during 1976 — where handled in this fashion. The Probation Service would screen the referral, interview the juvenile and family, provide information or advice, effect restitution where appropriate, make referrals to various agencies as required, and then close the file with a written summary of action taken.

I can only endorse the concept, I can't offer the honourable member any optimism with respect to specific expansion of programs of this nature although I must say that the appropriation that we're asking the Legislature to vote in 1978-79 in Probation Services, generally, including the

Conciliation Service, does call for an increase in funding and does involve an increase in such programs as the Program of Voluntary Probation Officers, the Placement Alternative, the Remand Attendance Centre, Short-term High Impact and Non-judicial Screening. In other words, the very programs I have talked about. This year we are asking \$724,000 in that area. Last year the government asked for 466.2. That, I believe, was the adjusted vote for 1977-78. So there is an increase in that area requested for 1978-79.

I might also say that the Ministry is attempting to reduce placement costs by offering support services to families to keep juveniles in the home, rather than institutionalizing them, and the Placement Alternative Remand Attendance Centre Program is the vehicle, as the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre knows, for accomplishing this.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is asking us for an increase in this particular area of 6.3 percent in overall but yet he has told us that the workload already has increased by three percent, relative to the involvement of the probation people. He didn't mention that the numbers of people in the institutions was up. So here again the Minister is but substantiating what I said earlier, that he anticipates being able to provide this service for 6.3 percent, when inflation — you know, everybody uses different figures, so I won't use one — is considerably higher than that for an increased workload. And from what the Minister has said it sounds to me as if they, once again, are following the errors of other governments in that they are freezing the non-institutionalized type of services.

If a person compares this to the next two items which follow — I don't want to be out of order, Mr. Chairman, but nevertheless it's a 6.38 percent increase relative to this item and a 9.2 for the institutional care of juveniles, and 11.24 for the increase in the institutional treatment of adults. Having been, as I said before, in that position, I know how difficult it is to attract dollars for the prevention, because it is so difficult to substantiate by having somebody talk to somebody you prevented them from doing something. But here again it's, in my judgment, one of the most important involvements other than the incarceration of those people who, in the interests of society, have to be incarcerated.

So the priorities of the government, I think, are backward in this regard that they are asking for a 6.3 percent to keep them out while at the same time, increasing it at 9.2 and 11.24 percent to keep them in there. So that perhaps the Minister could indicate when we get down into the other lines the population in the institutions themselves.

If somebody else has some questions on the Probation Services, per se, perhaps they should ask them at this time because I intend to go on to marriage conciliation, which is under this appropriation also. It always comes as a surprise to people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: We really can't pass this item until we go down to the marriage conciliation. So perhaps the Minister could break this item out for us as the staff man years that are involved in marriage conciliation, and also the involvement of this particular group of people.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, just let me say in general response to the honourable member's comments, that one reason why the requested expenditure in this area is up, is because we have been keeping more juveniles within their homes instead of putting them in institutions and that means we are using more probation officers.

With respect to the marriage conciliation service, the staff complement consists of a director, nine professional counsellors and four clerical personnel. The volume of cases handled breaks down this way, as between 1976 and 1977: In 1976 individual office interviews totalled 4,322, joint office interviews totalled 688 and court-ordered reports completed totalled 144. For 1977, the same three services stacked up this way: Individual office interviews 3,708, joint office interviews 574, and completion of court-ordered reports 165.

As far as the role and function of this service in terms of enforcement of maintenance orders is concerned, I think that it's possible for the province to take some satisfaction from the perspective that some additional strength, some additional clout, some additional achievement, seems to be accruing and developing and there seems to be potential for even more, as a consequence of the application of personnel in this service to that function.

At present, Mr. Chairman, maintenance pursuit in 600 cases is being handled on an ongoing basis. The estimated amount recovered and turned over to the Provincial Treasury to offset costs for families in receipt of public assistance under this program for last year — I believe this would be the last calendar year — was \$150,000, and in many other cases that function and that pursuit enabled families to remain at least financially independent.

I have discussed with my department officials, with my colleagues and with the Attorney-General,

the desirability that I'm sure is held by all members of the House for a stronger machinery for enforcing maintenance orders for ensuring that the maintenance order finds its way in the form of a cheque into the hands of the persons who need it, and that is in no appreciable order the children and the spouse who have been left in financial difficulty by the breakup of a marriage.

We are working as best we can, and as quickly as we can, to identifying the different technical and jurisdictional problems that have to be resolved to make real headway in that field. In the meantime, the use of the marriage conciliation service and our marriage conciliation officers to pursue those persons who have had judgments for maintenance made against them, and to obtain that maintenance for the needy dependents, is progressing at least hopefully. The application, as I say, of those personnel and that service to this worthy objective is proving beneficial. It's helping in tracking down persons who have been ordered to pay maintenance, in extracting such maintenance payments, and in getting them into the hands of the dependent families.

So that is a bright sign in what is generally a pretty difficult and dismal area, and one that I want to pursue as intensively as I can with my department officials and with the Attorney-General in the future.

MR. BOYCE: I really don't mind, Mr. Chairman, but it is rather strange that a member of the opposition must speak about all the wonderful things the government is doing.

The last figures that I have in this particular area was that a conciliation office was involved with 5600 cases and I think it should be put on the record because it is a small component within government, and they don't get much attention. Regretfully, they didn't get enough from me perhaps until too late.

But nevertheless, using 1976-77 figures, this staff was involved in orders under the Child Welfare Act for 1137 people. Under the Wives and Childrens Maintenance Act, there were 1791. Under the reciprocal enforcement of maintenance orders' they were involved in 111 and under the Marriage Act 17.

But the most important thing, under all these figures that come out of this particular area, over 2,447 people in the Province of Manitoba were counselled and as a result of that counselling, no legal action was necessary. And to finish it off, there were court orders under the Custody and Marriage Consents for 158 people, for a total of some 5,600.

But in this area, Mr. Chairman, Manitoba is low in the percentage of collection of maintenance orders. The Minister will find, or perhaps his staff has advised him, that we asked a small group — I think it was 2 or 3 people — to go to Sacramento, California, with whom we have a reciprocal agreement to look at what was being done in Sacramento, in the State of California, as a result of a pilot project established by the Health and Education Welfare Department of the Federal Government of the United States.

It seemed to the former Minister that duplication of research should not be necessarily carried out, because we have a reciprocal agreement with the United States — with California rather — they were only too willing to co-operate.

One of the things which causes the Minister some difficulty, as it caused me some difficulty, is the resolution in the two Acts which are currently before the House, dealing with Family Law, with Maintenance and with Family Law. So until such time as these Acts are formalized and the staff can see where the thrust should be made, the Minister is still in that somewhat tenuous position.

But I think I would like just to repeat it, Mr. Chairman, out of some 5,600 cases in 1976-77, the Minister doubtless has the figures for the last fiscal year, but out of some 5,600 cases, 2,447 of those resulted in no legal action being taken.

A year ago . . . Here again we go to the philosophy behind the establishment of this function in the first place. It was established at a time when the role of conciliation — in fact I think to this day they're still called conciliation officers on the roster — but their function was to argue people into staying together. The philosophy which we had in government was, that the people should be counselled to act responsibly in their own self-interest; and to discharge their responsibility to the children who were involved.

And here there is an interrelationship, and it's complex, but it's something with which I think we, as a society, can come to grips if we will deploy the resources to do so. People get married — and I would hazard the guess that most people get married because they want to — and the situation could change where they no longer want to enjoy this relationship, or no longer do enjoy this relationship, and they want to change it; there are books and books and books on this particular subject.

But one of the threads which goes through the literature is the change of economic conditions; that when things are going along relatively well and the family is growing up and they are functioning as a family, and situations change, that one of the partners starts looking for an escape in alcohol

or extra-marital relationships, or some other way to offset the disappointments of life, it causes strains on the marriage relationships which oftentimes ends up in the divorce courts. There's really no place that these people can go for counselling outside of their own churches or synagogues, or some other instrument in the society, to which they might relate if they so chose.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are so many people in our society which, you know, have no relationship to a church — whether informally or formally — they have alienated themselves and as a result they really have no place to turn for counselling. They're not even aware that such facilities exist.

I, for one, would not suggest to the Minister that he advertise that there is available in his department, this type of service, unless he is able to get the money to provide the service. Perhaps some day we will move to a system where some public support is given to a capacity within the community, that people can go and learn how to talk out their problems. There are many people who suggest that this would be in the public interest and in the final analysis it would be cheaper.

But here once again, it's a case of being very difficult to prove that prevention is actually cheaper than the consequences of ignoring the situation.

But I think the evidence that we have in these figures that I have just used, where there were some 5,600 marriages in 1976-77, in difficulty; that over 2,447, because of their involvement with the Conciliation Services, that no legal action was necessary. I'll admit that this is not infallible evidence, but nevertheless it is an indication that people — if they're given an opportunity to discuss their problems — are able to resolve them without the intervention of the legal system.

So that perhaps at this time when we're on this item, the Minister could relate his intent, as far as this capacity is concerned, on the assumption that the Family Laws — the two Acts which are before the Legislature — by and large proceed to enact them to the way they were drafted at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, all I can say to that is, that the presence and the work of conciliation officers obviously in this field — marriage conciliation — obviously and statistically has its demonstrable benefits and value. The references that I was making earlier, were to the application of the service to a limited extent in the area of enforcement of maintenance orders, and that of course is only one — and in fact a small role in relevant terms — carried out by this service.

The responsibility, really for the enforcement of maintenance orders is the Attorney-General's; and our Marriage Conciliation Service lends to SMYs on a full-time basis to this function. That loan resulted in the collection of \$150,000 last year. So I don't think that it can be minimized or lightly dismissed, but it's still only one aspect and one component of what the Marriage Conciliation Service is designed to do.

The figures referred to by the Honourable member for Winnipeg Centre are impressive, to say the least, particularly in the area of breakup or difficulty apparently forestalled, or prevented. He refers to the 2,447 cases in which no legal action was taken or found necessary or presumably found desirable, after counselling had occurred.

The Service, generally, is charged with and motivated by a commitment to attempt reconciliation of marital partners. It's also responsible for providing post-separation counselling for persons who have separated or divorced. It also is charged with providing the courts with social and legal information on matters relating to custody of children. It also is charged with counselling applicants in consent-to-marry cases in providing social histories in those cases, to the courts to help in decision-making; and then through the loan, as I've suggested, of these two SMYs, it helps in the pursuit of maintenance for separated or deserted women and children.

So it obviously offers a broad spectrum of services to the community, and in fact is no doubt spread as thinly as one would recommend that it should be spread, with those responsibilities on its table.

I don't quarrel with what the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre has to say about the service, or the rationale, for the service, or the kinds of results that have been achieved. I commend the service and the province in the past, for bringing it to this level. There's certainly every intention, on my part and on the government's part, to continue to support it as vigorously as resources permit.

I just wanted to stress that the service provided in the pursuit of maintenance and the enforcement of maintenance orders, is one that certainly commands some abiding interest from the present government and from the present Minister, and I'm hopeful that with what has been initiated in that area already, there are the seeds of and there is the potential for a quite effective corollary machinery, or ancillary machinery, to the procedures already in effect for insuring that we can guarantee our maintenance orders will have some teeth in them, in the future.

Short of successfully navigating all the technical, legal and jurisdictional hurdles that lie in the way of reciprocal enforcement of Maintenance Orders right across the country and right across the continent, this kind of corollary, or complementary service, is highly desirable and very worthwhile. I would like to pursue means and methods of expanding it beyond the present size that it occupies.

MR. BOYCE: Well, perhaps the Minister can have more success than I in the particular area. There is a difficulty for people who are in receipt of the moneys from a maintenance order in that if there is a default, there's a lapse of time that the people have to apply for some other type of social assistance to which they may be eligible. If a person defaults, then it has to go from this area over to the Attorney-General's Department for an enforcement order and if the person happens to be out of the jurisdiction then it's a time consuming process for the issuance of the orders between the various jurisdictions and for the acquisition of funds for funds if they successful in their attempts at locating and either garnisheeing or attaching a persons assets in another jurisdiction and the person who has to apply for assistance, it's rather a lengthy process. But here again I empathize with the Minister because it seems difficult to acquire the moneys necessary to establish funds, the revolving fund in this area and people seem to want to increase highways expenditures by 30 millions and rather than this service to people in difficulty.

I would hazard the guess that from the current economic conditions that the need for such services will increase, as well marriages and all cases have stresses and strains, nevertheless one of the biggest strains are economic conditions and there are so many people that are unfamiliar with the assistances that are available under law.

I know I risk the chagrin of the Member for Wolseley even mentioning the order of payments of debt legislation, but as conditions change and people allow an economic situation to deteriorate to the point where they throw up their hands and go into a divorce court, this is a very expensive process and it was to this area, Mr. Chairman, that I was addressing my earlier remarks with the idea that some of these situations can be avoided because there are so many people in the range of lower to upper middle management level who are strapped into a way of life which necessitates incomes from anywhere from \$15,000 to \$25,000 a year and I'm addressing some of my remarks to that particular group in our society that has well, for example, salesmen whose commissions are such that they establish a life-style, a recession of some type sets in and their income goes down. They get behind in their payments and they are faced with bailiffs knocking on their doors and the rest of this, you know, the type of difficulty that arises when a person does fall behind in their payments and oftentimes this is the type of thing which is an external cause to marriage breakup. But it is in this kind of service that I really think that governments, the former one, the present one and future one should address themselves in the provision of services to people who find themselves in difficulty. And once again when people avail themselves of the service and nearly half of the people who thought that they should proceed with divorces found that after they had availed themselves of some professional advice in this regard, found it not necessary so to do. So that as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, unless somebody else wishes to contribute, we'll pass this item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass; (c)—pass; (d)(1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, perhaps the Minister while he's waiting for his staff in this regard could take as notice the questions of the staff man years in the various facilities last year and this year, and the population as of last week in these various institutions.

MR. SHEAN: Mr. Chairman, the three facilities that we're looking at are the Manitoba Youth Centre, the Agassiz Centre for Youth and Seven Oaks Centre for Youth and total staff man years for 1978-79 for these three facilities is 229, for 1977-78 it was 228. It may well be that the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre shows that as 225 for 1977-78, but three were transferred from adult administration. They are in administrative roles in this branch and they were transferred from adult administration giving an actual total of 228 and this year's is 229. The populations of the three institutions — I can give the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre the average number of residents per day — for 1977 in the Manitoba Youth Centre was 171.5; that compares with an average daily total in 1976 of 151.4. I might say that the total of 171.5 is not perhaps as serious now as it would have looked when the 1977 average was calculated. That total is now down slightly but for comparative yearly figures we'd have to look at 171.5 as the figure for the year 1977. As for the Agassiz Centre and Seven Oaks Centre for Youth: the average daily population for at Agassiz for 1977 was 82.6, Mr. Chairman. It compares with the average daily population at Agassiz for the year previous 1976 of 86.9 and at Seven Oaks the average daily population for 1977 was 28.6,

which breaks down into girls 14.6 and boys 14.0, 28.6, and in 1976 the average daily population was 31.3, breaking down into girls 19.1, boys 12.2, so we're looking at comparisons of 28.6 for 1977 and 31.3 for 1976 at Seven Oaks.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister what the population was last week. Perhaps the Director could give me information of the population of the Youth Centre as of this morning, what it was for this past weekend and what the population of Agassiz and Seven Oaks were last week. And perhaps if you could include in those figures for the Youth Centre how many were child welfare.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll attempt to get those in a few minutes. Mr. Chairman, my officials have checked current records and I'm able to report that the population at the Manitoba Youth Centre as of yesterday was 124, of which 24 were child welfare cases which would obviously leave 100 under JDA. At Seven Oaks yesterday's population was 31, and at Agassiz yesterday's population was 120.

I might just say while the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre is absorbing those figures, that I'm very pleased and the department is very pleased with the results to date of the implementation of a number of recommendations emanating from the management audit that was done at the Manitoba Youth Centre last year and completed and implemented in the very late stages of year. The management audit which had been initiated in July of 1977 and resulted from administrative difficulties occurring at the Youth Centre was submitted to me on the 16th of November and there were a number of wide-ranging recommendations that were implemented as a result of that with a very successful and productive result and effect, both on morale of the personnel confined there and the staff and on discipline and on general administration throughout the centre.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with Rule 19(2), I'm interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return at the call of the Chair.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RESOLUTION NO. 3 — EQUAL PAY TASK FORCE

MR. SPEAKER: We're now under Private Members' Hour. Before we proceed I should like to ask the indulgenc of the House to bring to the attention of the House, a matter which I had overlooked and that was the propriety of Resolution No. 3 which is on the Order Paper, the first Resolution there, dealing with the Equal Pay Task Force. It has been brought to my attention that the wording of that resolution in the "Be it Resolved that this House consider the establishment of a task force composed of representatives from government, business, labour and women's organizations." If we just stop right there, if you think about it, this, if passed, would call on the consolidated revenue of the province and could in fact be considered to be a monetary resolution. In order to ensure that we don't set any precedence, I would like to ask the honourable member who introduced this resolution if he would be willing to stand by an amendment to this where we would have the resolution read: "Whereas the House consider the advisability of the establishment," and I wonder if that would be agreeable to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable to the members of the Chamber then? (Agreed)

Therefore we will proceed with the Private Members' Hour and the Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge as amended. It's now open for consideration. It has to be dealt with by the House. We have no speakers who are presently indicated that the resolution is standing in their order and it's now open to anyone who wishes to speak on it.

The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. LEN DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, I think that I would have to agree, certainly, with this resolution as presented to this House, or at least in general I agree with the principle. I think that we do have an inequity in our economy and in our society and if you look at the statistics, it is evident that women earn lower salaries than men and often for doing very similar jobs. I think that's not fair and it is something that this Assembly and the Government of Canada and other governments in part at least have to address themselves to. I think there are other groups and organizations which also have to address themselves to the question if we're going to come up with some answers.

But certainly I think we have to take a look at this equal pay for work of equal value, that the present legislation on the books will probably have to be modified at some time in the future. However, we should also be aware that when we are moving toward this equality, we can cause some disruptions to the economy and the economy of our province and of our country is certainly not in the best shape it has been in. It has already taken a number of shocks, some external and some from internal stimuli of various sources so I think we have to be very careful about legislating or about moving towards equal pay for work of equal value. I think it's essential but we can't rush this matter at all. I don't think it's healthy and, as I said a little while earlier, I don't think it's healthy that in our society we allow injustices, we allow discrimination or we allow gross inequalities like this, whether they are based on religious or ethnic grounds or, as in this case, based on the matter of what sex a person is in terms of their ability to earn an income.

As a Conservative, I believe very strongly that we have to, wherever in our society possible, we have to reward people according to what they produce, to their performance. We have to reward people according to their value to society. I'm not about to suggest that we leave those who aren't fortunate enough to be able to contribute in some way that we leave them destitute or in poverty. I think that we all agree that there is a need generally for society to take care of those who can't take care of themselves.

But the question concerning women and their ability to earn income is a different question altogether. Women don't receive a lower salary in many cases in our society because they are less productive or because they are less capable than males. They receive a lower salary simply because of built-in discrimination in the economic system. I think in this area unions have a large role to play and I'm not one who likes to rise to bait unions. I think it's important that members of this Assembly and others understand that I'm a supporter generally of unions. They are often or at least I haven't found them to this point in my career to be openly in favour or endorsing myself or my party but I think there's even hope for that in the future. I think that unions have served a very useful role in this country and our economy would be certainly a lot poorer if it weren't for unions and what they've done for the working person and for our economy and industry generally. There can be abuses, of course, just as there can be abuses in management and other areas of the economy but generally I find unions to play a very fruitful and a very productive, positive role. But one area in which unions haven't done a good job is this area here. —(Interjection)— The Member for St. Johns says he'll tell them. I can speak for myself and I will and I would just wish that you would hold your remarks until you have the floor. You can stand up but earlier this afternoon no one wanted to speak on this.

I would hope that unions in the future and the Member for Inkster, as mentioned, found several examples very recently where unions have taken a positive role. I think this sort of a problem and this sort of discrimination in our economic system can be handled, at least in part, through the collective bargaining process and it can be a function of co-operation between union and management. Certainly we've got to find more areas in which they can initiate joint endeavours and work together. I think here's one where they both stand to gain because we have to have an orderly updating of the salaries of women, we have to bring them up to the scale where men are and we can't do it drastically.

I heard this weekend some comments made by the Canadian Trucking Association. I didn't have a chance to study those comments in detail but they seem to be indicating to me that if we were to find ourselves in a position of bringing full equality to women in terms of salaries immediately that there would be a great rise in the cost of trucking and I'm sure that would be true for most all of our industries and we would fan inflation at a time when it's the last thing we possibly need.

I noticed that in the Member for Fort Rouge's remarks he referred to the Canadian Human Rights Act. It came into force in March of this year and the fact that this June they would be under that Act and they would be taking complaints from employees or groups of employees who felt that they weren't being dealt fairly with and they weren't receiving equal pay for work of equal value. That covers approximately one million people in Canada. At this time, I'm willing to wait and see.

I don't think we have to stand still on this matter of women's rights but I think we should wait and see because there are problems which can be caused by a too-rapid adjustment. I think we should wait and see what happens in the industrial sectors and those industries which followed in this legislation. They're not a small group at all but an excellent group for study over the next year or so, the one million employees who do direct business with the government. Let's see if we have any problems. Maybe then, as the Minister of Labour has indicated, the Department of Labour, the staff has got an ongoing program of reviewing this. We have competent staff in the Department of Labour. I think that's there's no need at this time for a task force. We've already had one large task force this year and the government hasn't had time yet to digest all of the recommendations from that task force.

We have certain basic rights guaranteed to women employees under the Employment Standards Act in Manitoba. I find after having done a quick study of the thing that they're probably not sufficient and that we certainly are going to have to look at changing those laws and changing the statutes which guarantee women equal rights. We may find ourselves following along the route the Federal Government has taken. If it proves to work, and not just the lip service legislation as we've had in the past, and if it proves not to cause some huge problem with our economy, certainly if we are a little patient and we wait, we can find that we can probably gain by being able to avoid some of their mistakes and get the situation corrected. The Women's Bureau also, as has been mentioned, is studying this matter and will continue to study it. I don't see why we need an outside task force appointed at this time.

I would at this time, Mr. Speaker, like to move and it is seconded by the Member for Emerson, that the resolution be amended deleting all the words after the second clause and substituting immediately after the words "work of equal value" in the second clause thereafter, the following:

"Be it resolved that the government consider the advisability of continuing to monitor and study the situation with respect to equal pay for work of equal value with a view to introducing measures as it considers necessary to ensure that the wage gap for work of equal value be reduced."

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't take very long. I had hoped that I might have had the opportunity to close debate on my resolution but now that the amendment has been made, I will simply make a comment or two. I'm glad to see that the Member for St. Matthews has finally won his long sought-after promotion but I suppose considering that he is the mover and initiator of a resolution on returning to capital punishment, he's obviously been assigned the job of chief guillotine artist for the Conservative caucus, that he's now found his role and his place and function in the Conservative caucus. He now fills, I should tell him, very honourable shoes that the former Member for Radisson fulfilled in that role for the past government and he carried it out with a great deal more, I would say noise, than the Member for St. Matthews does — panache would be a word for it — but nonetheless, it's a time honoured, parliamentary function for someone to apply the knife to resolutions.

I would only say, Mr. Speaker, that this particular form of erasure has to be one of the most ambiguous I've ever heard, read or seen in my life. It's like pounding you to death with a marshmallow. You know, it really has a certain kind of absorptive quality to it which one finds hard to react to but I suppose it had its intended purpose which is basically to eliminate the resolution.

I would just hope, Mr. Speaker, that we're very clear, that what the government is proposing as an amendment to the resolution in no way carries with it the spirit, intent or objective of the original resolution. What it is, is simply an endorsement of the status quo and, Mr. Speaker, the reason why I introduced the resolution is because I did not consider the status quo as the government now is proceeding to be nearly sufficient enough. I would want to dwell my arguments simply on that point. If the Member for St. Matthews and the Minister of Labour feels that what is presently being done by the Women's Bureau is the proper way to do it, I would agree if there was a Women's Bureau left but what has simply happened, Mr. Speaker, is that they have so attenuated and eroded the function and responsibility of the Women's Bureau to the point where they haven't even yet bothered to replace its director, to assign it the responsibility for doing all this work simply is a way of saying that they are avoiding the problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is perhaps the most serious commentary on the initiative of the government. When I heard the Minister of Labour say that she was quite satisfied that the Women's Bureau would continue to deal with this problem and be able to cope with it, I thought, my goodness, that one and a half staff man years that are left are certainly going to be put to the test, because aside from all the responsibilities they have for looking after a whole range and host of issues, they are now being saddled with one of the more difficult and complicated pieces of research and investigation.

So I assume, Mr. Speaker, that what is happening is that somehow they are going to pick up the spirit of volunteerism that the Minister of Health endorsed and I would hope that members of the Conservative caucus would be prepared to offer their services, their time and their energy to help the poor Women's Bureau because, frankly, Mr. Speaker, in its present sort of shortened and restricted limitations, in terms of staff and resources, to assume that it will be able to undertake this job is simply a way of hiding behind the subterfuge. I'm not critical of the Women's Bureau; I'm critical of a government which has basically signalled very clearly it's not interested in the work of the Women's Bureau because it hasn't bothered to staff it or promote it, or give it the resources

it needs, and now to have the gall and nerve to come into this House and say, "Enough is already being done," is, Mr. Speaker, stretching our credibility far beyond what I am prepared to accept. My credulity about this government is tested every day, in fact every hour, every moment, and I think the latest initiative by the Member for St. Matthews only tests it once more.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, at times we could get serious about these resolutions. This was not one that was going to cost any money. It was looking at a serious problem. Members opposite, while I heard them say they agree with the principle, but you know you don't agree with the principle unless you are prepared to give it some force, unless you are prepared to give it some action.

So to gloss over and say with a great deal of ease, "Oh, we agree with the principle," is really paying it the worst kind of insult. It means to say that you are prepared to say you agree with the principle without doing anything to implement it. And that, Mr. Speaker, really is a form of hypocrisy. It's an easy way of trying to say, "I don't want to be castigated for disagreeing but I'm certainly not going to do anything to make sure that it proceeds."

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that since the resolution has been introduced, I've had some interesting conversations and reactions to it. Several employers have called me, somewhat concerned about what I was proposing, that we would be introducing new legislation to get equal pay for equal value of work. When I pointed out to them that first it was a matter of simply doing the kind of necessary investigation to see how probable and feasible it was to do the kind of comparative analysis, they then would agree that it was necessary to do. Because they said, if they had prepared for them certain guidelines as to how it might work, that it would help them in their negotiations when it came to a matter of sitting down and working out the pay scales and compensation scales in bargaining; to have sort of valid objective facts and figures before them would aid and assist them in a very ticklish problem. So that the employers' community, once they understand that what was being recommended and suggested was simply a matter of assisting and enabling employers and employees to come to an issue, based upon proper information, then there was complete endorsement by those who objected.

What bothers me even more, Mr. Speaker, aside from the private sector, is I have also had some interesting reaction — I should tell the Minister of Labour this; she may be interested — that members of her own Civil Service are equally concerned about this problem. Because I have had some interesting reaction from members of the provincial Civil Service who understand, and who have said in very uncertain terms, that they feel the provincial Civil Service is going backwards at this stage, that the cancellation of the affirmative, the special section of the government that looked after affirmative action programs was a step backwards and they felt — particularly those who were female civil servants — that no action was being taken at the present time by the government. It may interest the Minister. I know she is not interested an awful lot in what goes on, but it may interest her to know that her own public servants, her own employees, are concerned that the present disparities, contrary to the position taken by the Member for Pembina, are growing wider in the provincial Civil Service with the pay scales that are being assigned to those occupations primarily occupied by males receiving higher compensation just simply through the normal bargaining process and the incremental process than those on the lower scales which are primarily occupied by females.

Mr. Speakrr, perhaps something that bothers me most is that we have a Minister of Labour who doesn't seem to be particularly interested in the condition of those who come under her own jurisdiction. Never mind what's going on in the private sector; never mind that for a moment. But she doesn't seem to be all that interested in pursuing the matter of what's happening to her own employees, to her own staff, the 12,000 or 11,000, or 10,000. I haven't kept abreast of how many have been eliminated this week, Mr. Speaker, so I don't know what the exact numbers are. But that perhaps is something that this government will have to reckon with and be cognizant of, that there is serious concern being expressed by their own workers, their own staff.

I suppose I should not have expected anything better from this government than this, other than the fact that I believe them to the extent that they said that they want to be good managers. You know, I heard a great deal of rhetoric, and still hear it, about what great managers they want to be. It would strike me, Mr. Speaker, that if you were a good manager the first thing you would be concerned about is the wellbeing and the equity with which you treat all of your people in your employ.

So I suppose I made a naive mistake. There are a few shreds of naivety still left, innocence that has been battered around. I guess after five years in opposition one learns very quickly that innocence is not a quality that carries one very far in this game. But the fact of the matter is, I thought that perhaps because they had taken such pride in their own ability to be good managers, they might be prepared to start a legitimate management process, which was to take the first and necessary step to deal with an emerging social and economic problem faced by their own employees, as well as by the larger workforce, which is the growing disparity of incomes created by men and women because of the occupational categories and conditions that we work under. But I suppose that I

shouldn't have been fool enough to assume for a minute that they really meant what they said, and it's very obvious from the amendment that has just been made, that we are back to things as awful. What I am afraid of, Mr. Speaker, is that it may be a sign of the times that this government, which calls itself Conservative, is really not Conservative; it's reactionary. It is not really interested in progressive conservatism, which is to try and anticipate problems and work in a methodical rational way towards a solution. They simply don't want to do anything. They simply want to stand still. When they talk about freeze, they are basically talking about their own mental attitude, rather than about any sort of economic measures. They are basically talking about the way in which they think and the way in which they act, rather than any sort of economic measures. And that is perhaps what is the most telling sign and tale that the speeches by the Minister and the Members for Pembina and St. Matthews have indicated. Principle, yes; action, no. Agreement with concept; no agreement to do anything about it, which was really a direct rejection and revocation of any commitment to principle.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope some members of this House would be prepared to support it. We should put on the record that it is a necessary and important problem to address. I think it should be understood that the Provincial Government, contrary to the words of this amendment, are not addressing the problem any serious way with extensiveness. And would point out to the Minister of Labour — Who knows? Maybe I shouldn't bother — but it is not something that should be dealt with by the one, two, or three, people working in the Women's Bureau. I'm not sure how many have been let go at this stage; I guess there is still a position top.

But presently in the Attorney-General's Department in the United States government, which I visited about three months ago and talked to the Women's Bureau there, which is working on the problem, that they have exactly followed this step, that they have a number of working committees throughout the United States in different jurisdictions, hundreds of people volunteering their time, both from the unions and from employees from different interest groups, who are following the lead of that government. Literally thousands of people are prepared to volunteer their time to come to some answer to this resolution. And, Mr. Speaker, we can't even get the slightest step off-centre from this government. So it's not a progressive or a conservative government, it's a reactionary government. TF3002

Mr. Speaker, I think that the rest of us are going to continually pay an ever-increasing price for the kind of attitude that has been displayed this afternoon in this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just would like to say a few words in connection with the amendment introduced by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

Mr. Speaker, I believe what the amendment illustrates is a desire by the government really to try to brush aside the problem which has been presented by way of this resolution, no attempt whatsoever to try to come to grips with the issue — rather than try to come to grips with the issue, rather try to find some way by which they can circumvent or move around the issue in question without dealing with it on a frontal basis.

As the Member for Fort Rouge pointed out, that if there ever was a marshmallow type of approach, the approach by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews certainly demonstrates to the fullest that marshmallow type of approach, and he has illustrated that well this afternoon. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I could probably say that he has picked up that approach insofar as the matter before us, from his front benches. I am sure he has picked it up from the front benches or from the Honourable Member for Pembina, who sits close to where he sits in the House, picking it up obviously.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment is very, very nebulous. It states, "Be it resolved that the government consider the advisability of continuing to monitor . . ." Then it goes on to say, "and to study the situation with respect to equal pay for work of equal value."

Surely, Mr. Speaker, if there is monitoring taking place at the present time, which is certainly not to promote or to develop, but rather to simply observe, surely, Mr. Speaker, we don't require a resolution from honourable members opposite to say: resolve that we continue to watch a situation. I would have given honourable members across the way a little bit more credit for practicality than to have proposed that to the Legislature.

Then they continue to monitor and study the situation with respect to equal pay for work of equal value, and say, "with a view to introducing measures considered necessary to ensure that the wage gap for work of equal value be reduced." Well, very fine, very nebulous statements. It is not going to commit the government to do anything on their part. It is the most nebulous, meaningless and shallow type of amendment that one could imagine.

What are they going to do, Mr. Speaker? They are going to monitor; they are going to observe; they are going to watch — but oh no, they are not going to take any chances on committing themselves

to one thing. And as the Member for Fort Rouge said, well, this was not a Progressive Conservative government, Mr. Speaker, this is a conservative government, a reactionary government that is not prepared to provide any thrust into any direction which would involve reform insofar as the ways of labour and social legislation. It's a reactionary conservative government. They ought to proudly call themselves the reactionary conservatives of Manitoba, rather than the Progressive Conservatives of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that in fact is what they will go down in history as being recognized as truly one of the most reactionary governments that this province has been blessed with.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the desperation effort to delete the third paragraph on the proposed resolution. What does the third resolution state? It states that Manitoba's equal pay legislation has decreased the wage gap between male and female workers in only limited circumstances. Isn't that true? On what basis are honourable members arguing against the third paragraph? Are they afraid, some way or other, that the third paragraph is embarrassing them in some way, shape or form?

Certainly equal pay for equal work legislation has only decreased the wage gap between male and female workers in certain categories. Who could argue with that statement? It's like arguing against the statement that the sun rises in the morning and sets at night, and yet honourable members delete the third paragraph.

Fourth paragraph: "Whereas there are no guidelines in Manitoba to assist employers in the implementation of equal pay legislation" — that certainly is the case. Honourable members chose to delete the fourth paragraph. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews did not choose to advise us as to why he was deleting the fourth paragraph from the resolution. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, he assumes that we ought to know why he has deleted both the third and fourth paragraphs. Obviously, he has received his instructions that the third and fourth paragraphs should be deleted; he does not feel it is necessary to provide any rationale for this bold and adventurous move on his part this afternoon.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply have to say that there is no way that the opposition could vote in support of such a nebulous, meaningless, useless piece of amendment which has been introduced this afternoon. To do so, Mr. Speaker, would certainly reduce us to the point of ridicule and I think it ought to certainly reduce the government to a point of ridicule.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Member for Selkirk speak I could not resist the temptation to ask the pages to bring me a copy of the journals for. . . I didn't specify any particular year, I could pick up 1976, 1977 but this one happens to be for 1977. Now, after listening to my honourable friend, I couldn't resist the temptation to read back to him one of the amendments that was proposed to a resolution that had been introduced into this House by the Member for Portage la Prairie. This is 1977 —(Interjection)— Well, he says it's the same thing. So the more things change, the more they remain the same but this one just had to be put on the record. He talks about nebulous, meaningless, amendments. Well let me, Mr. Speaker, draw one to your attention and this one, my honourable friend's opposite supported and they supported it I think because they believed and they felt that it was the kind of a resolution that deserved the kind of amendment that it got and the resolution itself dealt with the question of the Agricultural Credit Corporation and the Land Lease Program and I will not read the resolution, Sir, because it does not deal with the one before it, but I want to illustrate to you, Sir, the kind of amendment that was introduced to a resolution that had about eight clauses in it and the Member for Ste. Rose had the honour of introducing this particular gem. "That Resolution No. 8 be amended by deleting everything following the fourth line and that the following be inserted: Whereas the Land Lease Program has been beneficial to many Manitoba farmers." Now there, Sir, is an observation that had to be enshrined in a clause in a resolution. That the Land Lease Program has been beneficial to many Manitoba farmers. I suppose that my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk, would decree that that is not nebulous, that that is a very important clause which will add to the substance of an amendment. Then this appears: "And whereas recent amendments announced by the Minister of Agriculture have further improved the program." Now, that's looking forward as the Member for Selkirk wants a resolution to do. Then the final smasher, the *coup de grace* was administered with these words: "Therefore be it resolved that this House commend the Minister of Agriculture for the achievements made under the Land Lease Program". Now that, Sir, was the kind of amendment that my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk commended. Now those amendments in those days were meaningful.

My honourable friend the Member for Selkirk had the audacity in the light of the experiences that we had in this Chamber for the last eight years, to stand up and make light of an amendment that admittedly does not fulfill the complete requirements of the resolution initially introduced by

my honourable friend the Member for Fort Rouge, but I can say, Sir, that notwithstanding its shortcomings, it has a great deal more of a positive nature to commend itself to the House than those that were introduced by my honourable friends opposite when they were on this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment put forward by the Member for St. Matthews assumes that we have some faith in the government's ability to carry out any type of action geared towards affirmative action because the amendment says that the government consider the advisability of continuing to monitor and study the situation with respect to equal pay. And, Mr. Speaker, that's what concerns me. We don't have to look at what's going to happen in the future, I think we should monitor what's happened to date, what's happened in the last seven months with respect to efforts in this direction. We know that the Conservative Party is ideologically against any type of greater equality of income into our society and if they are so against greater equality of income, they certainly are putting tremendous impediments in the way of greater equality of opportunity. And, Mr. Speaker, it's concepts like this that are lumped together when we start talking about equal pay for work of equal value and we know what the Conservative position on that is philosophically, they're against it. So that's why members on this side of the House have a great deal of difficulty accepting that the government will in fact take this matter seriously when they move this type of amendment which will really just, in a sense, monitor the complete diminution of the affirmative action thrust.

Mr. Speaker, they are against this particular proposal in principle and they have been against it . . . Indeed their actions speak louder than words and I think this provides an opportunity to monitor what's really happened in the last seven months.

We had a director of the Women's Bureau leave. Have we had a replacement, have we had a full-time replacement for the Director of the Women's Bureau who did such an excellent job in putting together a program dealing with the employment and work related concerns of women in Manitoba? We haven't had anything done — it's been seven months already, seven months. Surely, surely we could have had some action taken if in fact this matter had any priority with the members opposite.

We've had a Career Planning Office within the Civil Service Commission abolished. What was this Career Planning Office supposed to do? It was supposed to look at ways and means in the Civil Service which could promote the concept of affirmative action not only for women, but people who are physically handicapped, people who might have been caught up in what might be called institutional racism, that is, no one is intending it but it exists, and it can be measured and we can point out the differentials that exist. This is what the Career Planning Office was supposed to do in the Civil Service. It had four people, four people and support staff, it was going to liaise with all the departments, all the departments were going to put forward programs which would promote affirmative action within the Civil Service, and as the government gained some experience in pursuing affirmative action in the Civil Service, it would then be in a position in the light of its experience to make suggestions to the private sector. And that was the way in which affirmative action was going to be promoted. That was the way in which concepts like equal pay for work of equal value were in fact going to be promoted in the Manitoba society. But what's happened? Those four people no longer work here. Imagine the negative pressures that exist on civil servants within the Provincial Civil Service now, which prevent these civil servants from putting forward any ideas of a positive nature regarding affirmative action. They see what's happened to those four people whose sole responsibility it was to develop the various complicated programs, procedures and changes in attitude that are necessary within a large organization like the Manitoba Civil Service, or are necessary within complex organizations outside the Civil Service in Manitoba's society to promote any type of affirmative action and greater equality for women and other groups in society. They see that those people have been rewarded with termination notices.

I've yet to come across any Minister when presenting his or her Estimates who has said, "Yes, we have taken the concept of affirmative action seriously. We have within our program this type of program dealing with the subject." I remember asking the Minister of Health specifically, "What was being done within the depart Department of Health and Social Development to promote all facets of affirmative action, including this particular one?" And, it's important that the Department of Health and Social Development take some action in this field. The Department of Health and Social Development is the largest employer in the Provincial Government and if anything was going to be promoted, if it was going to have any effect, surely it would have to take place within the Department of Health and Social Development. It's also in the Department of Health and Social Development that you have your greatest proportion of women employed and the greatest number of them are in lower paying positions and the Minister couldn't say that he had done anything positive

in this area.

He said that he'd try and come up with something next year, but he didn't have anything to offer this year. So if we monitor what's happened over the last year with respect to that one specific department, we find that nothing's happened. There has been a retrogressive step, they've stopped what was being done before when departments were producing affirmative action plans in conjunction with the Career Planning Office of the Civil Service, they've stopped that. So nothing is happening at this Civil Service level with respect to any programs geared to affirmative action, nothing is happening whatsoever and those people that had been involved in this program in the past have been terminated.

I suspect then that if we don't have resolutions prodding the government and pushing the government from members of both political parties on this side of the House, we will have no action undertaken by the government at all in this whole area, and it is a complicated area. It's a complex set of issues, but you don't bury your head in the sand when you come across complex sets of issues, you try and do further work. Even the document that was tabled the other day by the Minister of Labour, really is the product of the past administration. We have nothing coming forward from this administration as to what they will do in this area.

We know that nothing's happening in the Civil Service. We know that anyone associated with any type of affirmative action program, not only for women, but for other minority groups, we know that these people really haven't had anything to do and have been deemed expendable by the present a government and have been d terminated.

And what's happened at the political level? In the past administration there used to be a Cabinet Committee on Equal Opportunity. The Premier used to head that Cabinet Committee of Equal Opportunity, Management Committee staff, Civil Service Commission staff, Planning Secretariat staff, departmental staff, used to serve as staff to that committee of Ministers who were exploring the very intricate types of problems that develop within an organization when you try and bring about some change in an area like affirmative action which is seen in so many different ways by so many different people, and it was important that a Cabinet committee headed up by the Premier be established in the past because it was necessary for the government to indicate to the rest of the departments and to the Civil Service generally, that this was a priority item. That it required ' that extra bit of creativity on the part of staff and on the part of other people relating to the departments to try and find solutions to problems so that affirmative action could be promoted and pursued, rather than getting the usual list of reasons why, in fact, nothing can be done to change attitudes, to change procedures, to change classifications, to deal with questions like rug ranking which traditionally have really blocked the ability of women to really progress as they should within any organization so that they could get a proper reward for the type of work that they do. They just don't have and haven't had enough power.

So that's why it's important for groups to come along and undertake what might be called positive discrimination, something which is sanctioned by the International Labour Congress, something that's been approved by Canada in ratifying this agreement with the International Labour Congress regarding positive discrimination in certain selected areas, something which was ratified by the provinces as well, I think in 1953.

But we don't have that happening now. We have this Cabinet Committee disbanded; no one ever talks about it any more. We know what the Premier's attitude is with respect to affirmative action, we know what the Premier's attitude is with respect to women. And that's why when we monitor what's happening to date, we find that we can't trust this government to carry out even this vague type of amendment that they put forward. We know what the real intent of this amendment is, and that is, to kill this proposal, to kill any thought of trying to determine how something as complicated — and it is complicated — as equal pay for work of equal value can be pursued, not only in the Civil Service but outside the Civil Service in larger society.

The Member for Fort Rouge used the term "guillotine," and that's exactly what we're having imposed upon us here, it would appear, by the majority. And they say, "No, we're just going to monitor what's happening." Well, we find that there is no political commitment, generally, from the party opposite. We find that there is no encouragement of the Civil Service to develop ways and means of pursuing this type of program. We find that there is no encouragement to the larger society to look for ways and means of pursuing affirmative action. This is something that so many people like to give lip service to, but unless you start looking at the problem in some depth, unless you start looking at particular ways in which you might be able to say, change attitudes in job interviews, to change ways in which people are promoted, to look seriously at this problem, nothing will happen. And the easiest thing to do is to starve a thrust like this while paying lip service to it. And that's what's happened; it's been starved at the Civil Service level, it's been neglected at the political level, and now it's being guillotined in the Legislature.

And another very indicative act on the part of the Conservative government with respect to the whole area of affirmative action, and I think it's the most negative, the most reactionary, more

the most regressive of Conservative acts to date regarding affirmative action, was taken when the government proposed no increase at all to the clerical and stenographic unit of the Civil Service; no increase at all to them despite the fact that we do have inflation, despite the fact that these people at the lower end of the income scale — because the clerical stenographic unit is the unit which is paid lower than any other units in the Provincial Civil Service — really don't have the ability to cope with inflation running at 9, 10 and 11 percent; despite the fact that this group has in fact been under wage and price controls for a couple of years, we found that the government didn't make any substantial offer to this group at all.

But what did they offer to other groups in society? What did they offer to more powerful groups? They offered 6.6 percent or 6.8 percent to the doctors. What are they offering to professional and technical groups, engineering groups within the Civil Service? I would predict, and I would like to have the Minister of Labour, at some stage, table what the introductory offers were to the various component groups of the Public Service of Manitoba. And I would predict to you that the lowest offer was made to the clerical stenographic group.

So how can we naively support this type of recommendation or resolution to monitor and study the situation with respect to equal pay for work of equal value, with a view to introducing measures as it considers necessary to ensure that the wage gap for work of equal value be reduced? Mr. Speaker, I have just tried to monitor the actions to date and every one of them has been a negative step; every one of them has been a negative act. So I think we should monitor what's happened to date, and when one does that, one has to conclude that this government isn't interested in affirmative action, that it won't do anything, that we'll find ourselves a year from now with no new Women's Director appointed, with no action taking place with respect to affirmative action, with the Civil Service staff overloaded with other activities so that they haven't developed any of the concrete plans in consultation with departments, so that we can get some hard, tangible advancement of this particular concept. That's what we'll find.

You know, we're not monitoring progress, Mr. Speaker, we're monitoring the exact opposite. We are monitoring a whole set of retrograde steps, and as I said, Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words. The actions of this government to date have reinforced their words regarding a lack of concern for greater equality of opportunity, regarding a lack of concern for greater equality itself. So, when in fact you have principle and practice combined in the regressive extent that we have opposite, then, Mr. Speaker, we have no option but to vote against this amendment, to see it as a cynical attempt to try and pay lip service to something which they don't believe in, while at the same time stopping the program to all intents and purposes.

And we have this in a number of other areas, workplace safety and health, occupational safety — it's just not happening. We have members opposite paying lip service to something, but not really carrying it out. And Mr. Speaker, I have received no evidence from the government opposite that they will do anything serious at all to carry this forward and I am surprised that they would make this amendment. I think that if you look in this document that the Minister distributed, there are requests that some advisory groups should be set up, that some further work should be done to pursue this matter. And Mr. Speaker, we found none of it; we find nothing of concrete evidence to support this resolution, so therefore I would urge all the members to vote against it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to try and meet a challenge to conclude my comments before 5:30. The reason I rose to speak was that the Honourable House Leader went back to 1977 in order to find precedent, and I suggested he could look in 1966. Since he didn't do it, I asked for a 1966 journal and I found a precedent, Mr. Speaker; I found two. The first and second resolutions on the order paper, the second one is a motion brought in by Mr. Harris and amended by Mr. Klym of the government side to include the words "continue to study, etc." And I thought, well, that's where the Honourable Member for St. Matthews got his idea from, back in 1966 under the Roblin government. But the first resolution listed is a lengthy one which was brought in by the then Member for Seven Oaks, Art Wright, a lengthy one dealing with education which was then amended by the Honourable Mr. George Johnson, who put in a lengthy change which brought in such thoughts as "whereas the school districts have authority to conduct certain studies and they are co-operating in the promotion of adult education and they are conducting varied and extensive programs," and then continues by saying "The Department of Education continue to expand and promote adult education programs." Mr. Speaker, then the then leader of the NDP, Russ Paulley, moved an amendment to take out the words "to continue," take out the words "continue" to give it a positive thrust. That's what I want to do to this resolution to give it a straightforward thrust, and that is, I want the resolution to read, the resolved portion, "Be it resolved that the government study the situation with respect to equal pay for work of equal value with a view to introducing measures to ensure that the wage gap for work of equal value be

Monday, June 12, 1978

If that's what the Member for St. Matthews suggested, if that's what the government caucus is willing to support, then I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the amendment be amended by deleting from the operative part thereof, the following words: "Consider the advisability of continuing to monitor and . . ." and "as it considers necessary."

MR. SPEAKER: It's been moved by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, seconded by the Member for Selkirk, that the amendment be amended by deleting from the operative part thereof the following words: "Consider the advisability of continuing to monitor and . . ." and substituting, is it?

MR. CHERNIACK: And the words, "as it considers necessary," Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: And the words, "as it considers necessary."

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Just a straight deletion, is that it?

MR. CHERNIACK: Straight deletion of certain words that don't mean anything but fudge the issue.

MR. SPEAKER: I will take the amendment under advisement. The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair and the House will resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 o'clock.